

Daniel Murphy

THE
RELIGIOUS MONITOR,

AND
Evangelical Repository.

DEVOTED TO THE PRINCIPLES OF THE REFORMATION, AS SET FORTH IN THE FORMULARIES OF THE WESTMINSTER DIVINES, AND OF THE CHURCHES IN HOLLAND.

VOL. VII.

FEBRUARY, 1831.

NO. 9.

CONTENTS.

| | page. | | page. |
|--|-------|---|-------|
| ORIGINAL COMMUNICATIONS. | | SELECTIONS. | |
| Letter from a Minister to his People,..... | 513 | Letters on the introduction and progress of Unitarianism in New-England. No. V, 560 | |
| On the Divinity of Christ,—Dissertation II, 530 | | Exiled Swiss Pastors,..... | 574 |
| On the Appropriation which is in the Nature of Saving Faith,..... | 541 | Letter from Rev. James King,..... | 575 |
| An Essay towards bringing about a Scriptural Unanimity amongst all the different branches of the visible Church of Christ,—(Continued from page 469,)..... | 554 | No Religion without its Spirit,..... | 1b. |
| | | Education of the Appetites,..... | 576 |
| | | Talleyrand on Romish Oaths,..... | 1b. |

Thus saith the Lord, stand ye in the ways and see and ask for the old paths, where is the good way, and walk therein, and ye shall find rest to your souls.
JER. VI. 16.

ALBANY:
PRINTED AND PUBLISHED BY B. D. PACKARD & CO NO. 71 STATE-STREET.
Two sheets—octavo.

Handwritten text at the top of the page, possibly a title or date, which is mostly illegible due to fading and bleed-through.

Handwritten text in the upper middle section of the page.

Handwritten text in the middle section of the page.

Main body of handwritten text, consisting of several paragraphs that are extremely faded and difficult to decipher. The text appears to be organized into sections, possibly separated by horizontal lines.

Handwritten text at the bottom of the page, likely a signature or a concluding note.

L

S
ca
ob
so
C
pl
of
A
th
de
un
oc
for
ha
te
of
an
st
m
in

M
S
in
G
to
di
hi
g
en
of
w
a
se
pe
st
qu
st
w

THE
RELIGIOUS MONITOR,
AND
Evangelical Repository.

VOL. VII.

FEBRUARY, 1831.

NO. 9.

Original Communications.

**LETTER FROM A MINISTER TO
HIS PEOPLE.**

DEAR BRETHREN:—

It is known to you that the Associate Synod have of late engaged, in their judicial capacity, in covenanting. In doing this, their object was to declare in the most explicit and solemn manner, their allegiance to Jesus Christ, and give to each other, and the people under their inspection, the strongest pledge of sincerity in the entire profession of the Associate Church, and their determination through grace to exemplify it in their lives, defend it in their ministry, and transmit it unimpaired to posterity. The question will occur to some; have they *divine authority* for this their transaction? I answer they have. To expect authority, in express terms, for the time, place and circumstance of the transaction, would be unreasonable and inconsistent with the scriptures, as a standing rule for all ages; but for the nature, manner and ends of it, there is no difficulty in producing authority in abundance.

1st. *It is clearly comprehended in the Moral Law.* For this transaction of the Synod was nothing else than an acknowledging of Jehovah, three persons in one Godhead, to be their God—an engagement to keep pure and entire all such religious ordinances and worship as he has appointed in his word—a holy and reverend use of his great name, for ends and purposes clearly enjoined in his word, in which the keeping of the christian Sabbath is included; and it was a promise through grace to endeavour a faithful performance of the duties in the second table of the law. If you will compare the engagement to duties which was sworn and subscribed; with the duties required in the ten commandments, I am persuaded, that, with the exception of the words in which it is expressed, you will not

find a single point of opposition. Therefore, unless any will take upon them to prove that the Synod, as such, was not bound by the moral law, it must be admitted, that, without such an act, their obedience would have been defective, and consequently, that it has the authority of the moral law.

2d. *This transaction, properly and formally expresses an acceptance of the covenant of grace.* A short summary of the covenant of grace, we have in the following words of the prophet: "they shall be my people and I will be their God," Jer. xxxi. 33. and xxxii. 38. compare Heb. viii. 10. In covenanting the Synod have said:—"We avouch the Lord to be our God," and by various specified engagements, they have also said "we will be his people." Was not this as plain and formal an acceptance of that covenant as could be put into words? where is the difference between it and the act of Israel at his return, which Hosea foretells, "I will say to them who were not my people, 'thou art my people,' and they shall say *thou art my God.*" Hos. ii. 23. Therefore to deny divine authority to their act, is the same as to deny that they ought in a public and formal manner to accept of the covenant of grace: Some conclude that if a people be God's in their heart, it is a matter of indifference whether they say so or not; but they certainly do not understand either the design of God in *having* a people, or the nature of that principle, under the power of which, people are brought to give themselves unto God. As to the first, his main design is, that they "should show forth his praise," of which this public and express declaration that they are his, is no inconsiderable part. And the more public and express it is, so much the more does it agree with his design. As to the second, it is just as natural for the man who "believes in his heart" that he is God's, to "make confession of it with the mouth," as it is for him to breathe.

VOL. VII.

3d. *We have express authority for their act, in Ps. lxxvi. 11. vow and pay to the Lord your God.* There were many things vowed under the Law, which might or might not have been so, just as the person pleased. The Nazarite was under no moral obligation to make his vow. Hannah was not bound by the moral law, to vow that the child which the Lord might be pleased to give her, should be his. Of this sort was the vow of the four men mentioned, Acts, xxi. 23. Concerning this sort, the Scriptures say, "WHEN thou shalt vow a vow unto the Lord thy God slack not to pay it," Deut. xxiii. 21. And "better it is that thou shouldst not vow, than that thou shouldst vow and not pay," Eccl. v. 5. But in the text above quoted there is no such reserve. It is a peremptory command to "vow to the Lord our God," and not to do it, will be disobedience. It is required of "all them that are round about him," and upon a remarkable display of divine perfection, as the context will show, to the joy of the church and the terror of her enemies. Although it is not expressly said *what* is to be vowed, yet it is easily gathered to be in substance, what was vowed by Jacob at Luz, "if God will be with me, &c. then shall the Lord be my God:" such a vow is the duty of all who profess to fear God, in every age and nation. But wherein does the vow of Synod differ from this? Did they not, according to this command "vow to the Lord their God?" This is undeniable.

4th. *It will not be difficult to find authority in the words of the Psalmist,* "My hands also will I lift up to thy commands which I loved." "I have sworn and I will perform to keep thy righteous judgments," Ps. cxix. 48. 106. For if the Psalmist under the infallible direction of the Holy Ghost, set down his covenanting in the Psalms, it is plainly intended that all whose duty it is to sing these Psalms should go and do likewise. And unless it can be shown that the profession of the Associate Church is not agreeable to God's commands—not founded upon his "righteous judgments," it must be admitted that the act of Synod coincides with that of the Psalmist. In the sincere and firm belief, that the profession was agreeable to the word of God, they lifted up the hand to it and sware. But what can those people mean who startle at lifting up the hand and swearing to continue in the belief and practice of the truth, when they sing these verses, unless it be the very opposite of what their lips express?

5th. *It has authority from the prophecy*

in Isa. xix. 18. 25.—In these verses two things, principally, are foretold, first, that the Egyptians shall become God's people, worshipping him in all the ordinances of his appointment, among which, vowing and swearing to the Lord, holds a conspicuous place; and second, that their conduct in this, receives divine approbation. Although these events were to fall out under the Gospel, for they could not under the law, yet they are expressed in terms borrowed from the Law. "In that day they shall do sacrifice and oblation," ver. 21. "There shall be an altar to the Lord in the midst of the Land," ver. 19. In other words Christ crucified shall be generally preached, and those ordinances instituted by him observed. "And a Pillar in the border to the Lord," ver. 19, "And it shall be for a sign and a witness (or a public testimony) unto the Lord." "Yea they shall vow a vow unto the Lord and perform it," ver. 21; or they shall engage by solemn covenant to serve the Lord; "Five cities in the land of Egypt shall speak the language of Canaan and swear to the Lord of Hosts," ver. 18; which, if it means any thing, means that swearing to the Lord of Hosts is a chief and prominent part of the language of Canaan. This oath we take to be an oath of allegiance to the Lord of Hosts as King and head of the Church, to maintain and defend the whole constitution which he has given to his spiritual kingdom. The *language of Canaan*, I take to mean the true religion, for in it was carried on the worship of the true God, and that private conversation which was agreeable to it. This interpretation is strengthened by Zeph. iii. 9. "For then will I turn to the people a *pure language* that they may all call upon the name of the Lord and serve him with one consent." The service of God makes any *language pure*, and for that same reason, the *language of Canaan*. Therefore swearing allegiance to Christ is a chief and prominent part of the true religion in New Testament times, and the Egyptians shall in these times be a covenanting and witnessing people. And, as to the second thing, that their being so, has divine approbation, there are many things said which prove it; but the 25th verse is itself decisive—"whom the Lord of Hosts shall bless, saying, blessed be Egypt my people." Now my inference is, that this covenanting and swearing to the Lord will have his approbation, when, where and by whomsoever it is done, under the Law and under the Gospel, by Jews or by Gentiles, Egyptians or Americans, because it belongs

to the true religion. And where is the difference between this and what the Synod have done? Most assuredly they vowed and sware to the Lord of Hosts.

6th. *A public confession of the name of Christ is incomplete without public covenanting.*—This will appear manifest upon comparing two passages, one in the old testament and another in the new. Isa. xlv. 23. "I have sworn by myself, the word has gone out of my mouth in righteousness and shall not return, that unto me every knee shall bow and tongue shall swear," either voluntarily under the constraining influences of his Grace, or the tremendous power of his iron rod. Those who do it voluntarily, will, in substance, swear as follows: "surely, shall one say, in the Lord have I righteousness and strength." Compare Phil. ii. 10. 11; "That at the name of Jesus, every knee should bow, of things in heaven, and things in the earth, and things under the earth, and that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord to the glory of God the Father." Two things are here obvious, *first*, that the above prediction is here applied to the submission due to Christ as King of the Church; and *second* that "the tongue confessing that Jesus Christ is Lord," necessarily includes the above swearing and saying, "surely in the Lord have I righteousness and strength." And therefore *confession* would be incomplete without it.

But is it not the duty of all to make as complete and full a confession of Christ as it is in their power to do? or will any *friend* of his dare to say that we *may* be too particular and full in this duty? And what have the Synod said, any thing more or any thing different? They have said and sworn, "surely in the Lord have we righteousness and strength."

7th. *They have authority, also, for subscribing their deed with the hand*, in the 44th chap. of the same prophet, and 5th verse. "One shall say I am the Lord's, and another shall call himself by the name of Jacob, and another shall subscribe with his hand unto the Lord," &c. That all this particularity has the seal of divine approbation, will appear from this, that it is done under the influence of the spirit poured out. Immediately before this, God says, "I will pour water on him that is thirsty, and floods on the dry ground, I will pour my spirit upon thy seed, and my blessing upon thine offspring, and they shall spring up as among the grass," &c. Agreeably to this passage Jeremiah says—"This is the *name* whereby he shall

be called, The Lord our righteousness." xxxiii. 16.

8th. *Authority for it is contained in the two following passages which I mention without comment.*—Jeremiah iv. 2. "And thou shalt swear the Lord liveth in truth, in judgment and in righteousness, and the nations shall bless themselves in him, and in him shall they glory." Rom. xii. 1. "I beseech you therefore brethren by the mercies of God, that ye present your bodies a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable unto God, which is your reasonable service."

9th. *It has been frequently exemplified.*

First When the law was given and Israel was organised as a church, "And he took the book of the covenant and read in the audience of the people, and they said, all that the Lord hath said, we will do and be obedient, &c. Exod. xxiv. 7. From this instance it may be inferred that God *will have* his Church to walk with him in the way of solemn covenant engagement, and that in no other way can the Church upon receiving his laws and ordinances, properly express her acceptance of them and submission to them. And accordingly when that system of types and ceremonies was to be set aside and the Gospel order, as founded on the death and resurrection of Christ, was to be set up, it too was given as a covenant, and consequently ought to be received in a similar way, see Isa. xlii. 6.

A *second* instance took place on the plains of Moab, at the express command of God, Deut. xxix.

A *third* time it was done before the death of Joshua, when the people solemnly engaged and said, "Nay but we will serve the Lord," Ch. xxiv. 21.

Again: in the regency of Jehoida the priest, they entered into a covenant "to be the Lord's people," 2 Kings xi. 17. In the reign of Asa "they entered into a covenant to seek the Lord God of their Fathers with all their heart and with all their souls, and they sware unto the Lord with a loud voice," 2 Chron. xv. 12. 14. In the reign of Josiah "they made a covenant to walk after the Lord and to keep his commandments and his statutes and his testimonies, with all their heart and with all their soul, to perform the words of the covenant which are written in the law," 2 Chron. xxxiv. 31. In Ezra's time they made a covenant to put away all the strange wives, Ch. x. 3: In Nehemiah's "they entered into a curse and into an oath to walk in God's law which was given by Moses the servant of God, and to observe

and do all the commandments of the Lord, and his judgments and his statutes, and that they would not give their daughters to the people of the land, nor take their daughters to their sons; and if the people of the land brought ware, or any victuals on the Sabbath day to sell, that they would not buy it of them on the Sabbath or on the holy day, and that they would leave the seventh year and the exaction of every debt, Ch. x. 29. 31. And in the gospel time it has been often done, and even in the Apostle's days. He says of the Macedonian church, "and this they did not as we hoped, but first *gave themselves to the Lord*, and to us by the will of God," 2 Cor. viii. 5.

Farther, this act perfectly harmonizes with the several characters sustained by the Church. From the moment of her organization she became the *army* of the living God, and must so continue until the contest with the serpent and his seed is decided. She is a militant or a fighting church, and her life, to the end, must be spent in war and battle. And who will deny that she acts in character when she lifts up her hand and swears allegiance to the King, and who would not suspect the fidelity of that army who would refuse to do this?

Again: she is God's *WITNESS*, solemnly called on, both under law and gospel, to give testimony on every point that shall be at issue between him and his enemies. Neither is this a mere accidental character, but one that is essential to her. That moment she became a church, she became also a *witness*; and that moment in which she shall completely and thoroughly cast off this character, she ceases to be a church of God. But is it not plainly agreeable to this character and necessary to it, that she engage by oath and covenant to tell the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth? In this particular the common sense of mankind so fully concurs, that they have made the refusal of a witness to swear this, a punishable offence.

Lastly, she is the "Bride, the Lamb's wife." Where and who is he that will deny that she acts in character, when she solemnly vows before God and men to be Christ's wholly and forever and not for another? After all this, can you doubt whether Synod had divine authority for what they did? Some object, because,

1st. It is only a man's covenant, and to claim for it divine authority is too much. God calls no covenant his but those which he expressly enjoined. Answer. Any promise made by the church agreeably to his revealed will, he acknowledges, and holds

her responsible for its fulfilment, as much so as if he had commanded her to make that promise. He says of the covenant which Zedekiah made with the people to set at liberty their bond servants—"Ye were turned and had done right;" and when they fell from this and caused them to return again to their masters, he threatens them in these terms—"And I will give the men that have transgressed my covenant, which have not performed the words of the covenant which they had made before me, when they cut the calf and passed between the parts thereof, into the hand of their enemies," Jer. xxxiv. 18. 20. After the same manner he reproves this Prince for his breach of oath and covenant with Nebuchadnezzar King of Babylon, Ezek. xvii. and he calls it "my covenant" ver. 19. And it makes nothing against this argument, to say that God means by this, the covenant made at Horeb, because these particular covenants are so far identified with that, that the violation of the one is the violation of the other.

2d. The church is bound to every thing moral in that covenant made at Horeb, and it comprehends the whole duty of the church, therefore there is no need for any other covenant. Answer. Why then did God command Moses to make *another* covenant with them in the land of Moab, besides the covenant which he made at Horeb? Deut. xxix. 1. This objection condemns all the instances of covenanting under the Old Testament, which yet are manifestly set down in scripture with divine approbation. But the truth is, it is not enough to *be* under covenant obligation, because, *covenanting* itself is a standing duty of the church and a part of the honor which God exacts of her, in all ages.

3d. It is not expressly mentioned in the New Testament which surely would have been done if it had been so great a duty.

Answer. Unless the authority of the Old Testament be wholly set aside, in things moral as well as ceremonial, it is sufficient that it is expressly mentioned and positively commanded *in it*. The New Testament proceeds on this principle, that any thing moral commanded in the Old Testament, stands, and therefore, there is no necessity for repeating it. Therefore the ten commandments and a multitude of precepts that grow out of them for particular cases in society, are not given again, but recognized as already given, in which this very duty is included.

It has been shown from Isa. xix. 18. 25. that it was to be practised with approbation in New Testament times. And if it be

impossible to give Rom. xii. 1. any sound interpretation which excludes this duty, then we have express authority for considering it one of the most eminent fruits of the mercies of God, through Jesus Christ.

4th. Since the same obligations are implied in Baptism and the Lord's supper, what need is there of this covenanting, or what propriety is there in it? Answer. It is needful to do every thing which God has commanded, as this is, and in the precise way and manner in which it is commanded. Moses and Israel might have offered this objection on the very same ground, unto God when at Horeb, and again in the plains of Moab, when he commanded them to enter into covenant with him. They might have said "since obligations of the very same extent are implied in circumcision, under which we, as the seed of Abraham, were brought to thee 430 years ago, and since we in our own persons did substantially come under them again in the late celebration of the Passover, what need is there of this covenanting or what propriety is there in it? Nay this objection implies an impeachment of God himself, for it might be said to him, since he once made promise of all in the covenant of grace to Abraham, what need of repeating it again and again and adding to it his oath. But if it be proper to receive the SEALS of the covenant, who can disapprove of the propriety of formally and expressly taking hold of the *covenant itself*? Jonathan made David swear a *second* time *because* he loved him. Is there not ground to conclude that very many refuse to swear the *first* time because they *do not* love Christ much or any at all? For to me it is inconceivable that he whose heart is warm with love to that great and glorious one, *could* thus stand to economise the expressions of it.

5th. Some say where is the authority or reason for the *binding* obligations of covenants upon posterity? Answer. The general principle upon which this is maintained is embraced in both the covenant of works and the covenant of grace. And to be consistent in refusing this sentiment, we should have to deny the imputation of the guilt of Adam's first sin and of Christ's righteousness. God has recognized the binding force of the covenant made at Horeb, in his dealings with every generation of Israel to the present hour. And let it not be said, that this was because it was a covenant of his own appointing, because certainly the covenant he made with the Gibeonites was not of his appointing, and yet he held the nation through successive generations bound by it. It is a

principle commonly acknowledged and universally acted on among men. Every nation considers itself bound by its own legal and constitutional deeds, though it may be ages and generations after the individual framers of them are gone. We do this day hold ourselves bound by the declaration of independence. In like manner a church is bound by her own promises and oaths, made agreeably to the word, while she continues to be the same society. And therefore we say, that we are bound by those covenant engagements entered into and sworn many ages ago, because we are the *same body ecclesiastic* which entered into them. For it must be recollected that it is neither time, place, nor individuals that make the identity of a church, but her *constitution*. Therefore, although we are a seceding minority, yet, because holding to the original principles and constitution of the church which made these covenants, *we are that church* and bound by them. This takes no advantage of those who join in our fellowship, because, after an attentive perusal of our standards, in which this doctrine is set forth, and satisfaction therewith declared, or necessarily understood, they assume these obligations by their own free act of accession.

6th. And last. Some do not see it to be *seasonable* at present. Answer. Being a moral duty it can never be out of season, any more than to be chaste or honest. But it was believed to be peculiarly seasonable at present, because,

1st. Numerous and incessant attempts are making to lessen all regard to a scriptural profession, and the most seductive wiles are employed to allure into modern liberalism those who yet adhere to it.

2d. Lukewarmness to the principles of the reformation prevails to an alarming extent even among those who still profess to be friends, and very many set their names to a witnessing profession who scarcely give it any other countenance.

3d. The simple act of adherence to a profession has become ambiguous. It is done by some in a general and vague manner, and does not express their approbation of every particular included. And it means nothing more with others than a ceremony which is necessary in order to admission to Baptism and the Lord's Supper.

And 4th. A flood of errors and innovations have come in and threaten to overthrow the order and constitution of the church of Christ. These things give to all the friends

of present truth, a loud call to come forth, in the most explicit and unequivocal manner possible, in its behalf.

I now propose for your consideration another question. Is this the duty of Synods and ministers only, *or of private christians and congregations also?* Are not those arguments adduced to prove it the duty of the former, as conclusive in proving it to be also the duty of the latter? It has been shown to be clearly comprehended in the ten commandments, and are not you and all men bound to observe as a rule of life every thing comprehended in them? By what principle soever a man can reason himself not bound to vow and pay to the Lord his God, by the same may he prove that he is released from the whole law.

Covenanting is an acceptance of the covenant of grace, and in no other way can a society of believers so fully and properly express their acceptance of it. Is it not your duty to accept of it? This no sober Christian will doubt. And surely it can be no less your duty to *declare* that acceptance. It is needful, in order to convince all that you are not *ashamed* of the connection. It is due to fellow professors, to satisfy them that you are sincerely attached to the common cause; and above all it is due to that God who hath so solemnly and explicitly declared himself pledged to accomplish the promise of that covenant, to come forth, in the most solemn and explicit manner possible, to accept of it.

Again: it is taught and exemplified in the Psalms. The binding authority of that portion of the word you are continually acknowledging. Every moral duty there expressed, you are tacitly declaring to be *your* duty every time that you sing them. There is but one way in which I can conceive it possible for any child of God to be opposed to this duty and at the same time use the following words of the spirit of God, "vow to the Lord your God and pay all ye that near him be"—"to thy commandments which I loved my hands lift up I will," and that is, by not thinking what they are saying.

It is your duty to "confess that Jesus Christ is Lord," and to do so in as full and particular a manner as you possibly can, but it has been shown that swearing to the Lord is included in the Apostle's meaning, and this is within the ordinary measure of Christian attachment, and therefore, clearly your duty. And what can be more certainly the duty of every believer, or more plainly suitable to every case, than the matter of the

oath mentioned by the prophet; "surely in the Lord have I righteousness and strength." And is it not, Christian reader, a very weighty matter to stand out against this duty, seeing Jehovah has even pledged his Being, "that every knee shall bow to him and tongue shall swear?" Consider that when the Apostle exhorts to this duty he is not addressing ministers or church courts only, but all the members of Christ's mystical body together. See at large, Rom. xii. In the plains of Moab it was not the Priests and Levites only that were required to engage in it, but "your Captains of your tribes, your Elders and your officers, and *all the men* of Israel, your *little ones*, your *wives*, and the *stranger* that is in thy camp, from the *hewer* of thy wood unto the *drawer* of thy water, that thou shouldst enter into covenant with the Lord thy God and into his oath," Deut. xxix. 10, 11, 12. In Nehemiah's time, it was the duty of "all that had separated themselves from the people of the land unto the law of God, their wives their sons and their daughters, *every one* having knowledge and having understanding." Ch. x. 28.

Does not consistency and good faith require this duty of you? The Westminster Confession is a covenant sworn at sundry times by the Church of Scotland, of which we are a part, and in this character that instrument is held by the Associate Church, and you, before a constituted court of Christ have assumed it as your own.

In the testimony, besides the permanent obligation of these engagements on us, it is contended that public religious covenanting is a part of the homage which the church in every age and nation owes to Christ; and this testimony you have said and some of you have often said, *is ours*. How then can you redeem these pledges to Christ and his church, or maintain consistency of *character* and refuse to embrace the first opportunity of performing this duty. To the weak and uninformed *time* is conceded to use all means and diligence to come to satisfactory clearness, upon the faith of a friendly disposition towards the duty, and a sincere purpose to seek without delay requisite instruction. And when this is the true state of the case, with an ordinary capacity and the common diligence used in obtaining other ends, it is not long till it is found. But when this concession is asked for the purpose of hiding a secret antipathy at the duty, or an absolute indifference about it, which is no better in itself and more hopeless of cure, the longer time that is given and the more pains used

to instruct, the more dark and perplexed the subject appears; by degrees it excites disgust, and finally the tardy truth comes out that they are *opposed* to it. They may still say that they have not changed their minds in the least, and this may be true, but how shall their first and their last step be reconciled together? How shall their conduct in this whole matter be exculpated from treachery to that society whose confidence they could never have obtained but by daring before God to belie their own purpose? But I hope better things of you.

Have not posterity a claim on you for this duty? At their baptism you promised to teach them the way of life according to the best of your abilities, and in particular the truths and duties of your own profession. On your faithful performance of this, under the divine blessing, depends their salvation and their present comfort in walking with God.

Again: on *their* being faithfully taught depends their ability and qualification to transmit these truths unto their sons who shall arise, and by a chain of such dependencies, the interest of the latest posterity hangs upon your fidelity to your vow. And while the habits and opportunities of private Christians do not permit them to go far in detail of the doctrines and practices of their profession, *here is a duty* within the compass of the weakest capacity to understand, and the circumstances of the *poorest* to perform, which gives a concise but distinct expression of the *whole* profession, and with all, so public and so solemn an example as may leave on their minds an impression never to be effaced.

For ought that you know, God of his rich mercy may give such power to your deed as will send the truths embraced in it down to the latest posterity. But, if on the other hand, through your neglect of this duty, every succeeding generation of professors shall become more ignorant than the one before it, until every peculiar doctrine of salvation has vanished from their visible forms of religion, and their souls for lack of knowledge shall sink into endless perdition; what will you answer? If there be any mercies in the covenant of grace, if any solemn vows, if any worth in immortal souls, if there is a judgment seat, let not this solemn testimony to the only possible way of salvation be withheld.

Do you not owe it as a duty to your own souls? will there no spiritual profit result from it? When it is as it ought to be, an act of faith appropriating, an expression of the heart, I see no limits or bounds to its

happy fruits and effects. Where the soul shall in that act recognize the great Three in One, Jehovah as its portion, a consolation and a joy unspeakable must spring up within it. Henceforth it may be no more sad. Faith, love, patience, meekness and all the graces may receive new strength. Unbelief, fear, pride and all the affections of the flesh may receive a death-blow. The bitter waters of affliction may be sweetened. The way of duty may become delightful and pleasant; and it may give courage to your hearts and boldness to your faces in the day of battle, and the enemy will flee seven ways before you.

With a soul thus refreshed, it must be that your conversation will become more edifying to your brethren and theirs to you also. The fragrance of this holy anointing will fill the domestic habitations, the public assembly of the saints, and the whole sphere of duty. Reciprocated on every side, it will melt away every prejudice and hard feeling, and kindle up a bright flame of brotherly love, confidence and sympathy, until the whole congregation is animated by one soul. Then how amiable would the tabernacles of his ordinances and his grace be to your souls! To attend upon them, to support them in every proper way, to watch over their purity, to teach them to your children, and to commend them to all around, would be an enjoyment as well as a duty. And this, again, would be a strong barrier against innovation and defection. For this is the way to be rooted and grounded in the love of the truth; in this way the heart becomes established in grace, and the mind attains to the full assurance of understanding. Every wind of doctrine may then blow with all its fury and the tempest of persecution may roar with satanic rage, but you will stand. The top may bend beneath the blast, but your roots will strike deeper into the soil of eternal truth. And may it not be blessed to beholders; may not a testimony so public, so solemn and express, establish a conviction of the reality in religion on the hearts of many, to which, by the grace of the Holy Ghost all their prejudices may yield at once, and they who have hitherto stood afar off be brought near even into the household of God.

What is now your answer?

1st. All this we believe, say some, but we are not worthy. Answer. This is true, we are not and never can be worthy to enter into covenant with God. But the objection goes too far, for we are as unworthy to receive baptism, the Lord's supper, the preaching of the gospel or any spiritual priv-

ilege. We are not worthy of Christ and salvation; shall we therefore stand back from *all* the offered mercies of God's purpose and grace and *all* the duties of religion? Let Christians beware of the spirit of this objection; it is at variance with the claims of sovereign free grace. There is no worth either supposed or required in us, and the redeemed will eternally acknowledge their unworthiness and ascribe all worth to the Lamb.

2d. Others say, we are not prepared. Answer. This may be the fact, and preparation is necessary. *First.* We ought to have a competent understanding of this duty, to do it ignorantly would not only be unacceptable but profane. But a diligent use of means, with earnest application for the teaching of the divine Spirit, will soon enable any one entitled to sit at the Lord's table to acquire a competent knowledge of it; to know that it is not a covenant of works, upon the keeping of which we are to be justified and on the violation of which we are to be condemned, but a public and joint declaration of the church's belief in God's covenant of grace and her acceptance of it. That it is an act of public and solemn religious worship, in which she gives testimony before God to the present truth and the whole truth; and that it is an engagement to all the duties of new obedience, in a sole dependence on the grace that is in Christ. *Second.* The heart ought to be rightly disposed towards it. We ought to be disposed heartily to approve of this covenant of grace and to take hold of it. And here lies the chief difficulties of all serious Christians; they are not satisfied with the disposition of their hearts and affections towards it. Nor will this be an easy matter to settle with a tender conscience. In this particular there is so much for every one of us to do within himself that there is but little room and less ability in one to help another.

But there are two things here which we ought to inquire into. *First.* Are our affections of the right sort? And *second.* Of what measure are they? As to the first: Does a consideration of this solemn duty bring upon the heart a deep sense of sin and unworthiness before God? Are we led by it to renounce all self-sufficiency and self-righteousness? Do we admire the amazing condescension and love of God? Are we brought anew to place our sole dependence on Christ as all in all? Is there any delight in the prospect of thus publicly appearing on the side of Christ? Any desire to say with David—"All my salvation and all my desire." Finally, do you desire to be only

wholly and forever his? With *any* measure of these affections and desires, however small, it would not be warrantable to stand back. Nevertheless it is still proper to inquire—second, *what measure* of these we have; to ascertain how small it is; to be deeply affected therewith; and to use all means and cry mightily and give him no rest until he pour water on him that is thirsty and floods on the dry ground, his Spirit upon our seed, and his blessing upon our offspring. These two things, understanding and the approbation of the heart, were all that were required as preparation for this duty in the time of Nehemiah: "every one," men, women and children, "having knowledge and having understanding," Ch. x. 29; for the term knowledge in this text, means an experimental knowledge and approbation. But if under this objection, any conceal a criminal apathy and indifference to the duty, and a disinclination to relinquish the pleasures of sin and come into close fellowship with God; it will not answer their purpose. Such a spirit will not long remain a secret, it *will* speak in due time its own language and leave them to account some other way for neglecting this duty.

3d. Some seem to speak of this duty, as though they apprehended some danger in coming so near God. But there is no danger to any thing but sin, for he is a God of love, the fountain of living waters, a Father that pities his children, and the nearer to him the more safe and happy. But if men have in all their professions made a reserve in favour of some sin, and against some truth or duty, and are still determined to adhere to it, no doubt there is danger. "Cursed be the deceiver, that hath in his flock a male, and voweth, and sacrificeth unto the Lord a corrupt thing." Mal. i. 14.

4th. Some plead excuse in the words of Ecclesiastes, "Better it is that thou shouldst not vow, than that thou shouldst vow and not pay," (ch. v. 5.) and as they cannot expect to keep free from sin, which would be a breaking of their vows, they conclude it is better for them not to vow. But this is not a correct view of the text, nor of covenanting. This text applies chiefly, if not exclusively to such things as were of pure choice, vowed unto the service of God, and things that were fully in their power to pay; for example, when a man vowed to give a male from his flock, or when Hannah vowed that the child should be the Lord's, such vows could be fully paid, as far as respected the thing vowed. But, admitting that it applies to all vows and to this covenanting,

we do not in it engage and promise to live *without sin*; we abhor this doctrine as the fruit of self-sufficiency and gross ignorance of the human heart. But we vow to *war* and *fight* against *all sin*, and if that enemy should some times prevail, it does not follow that we have broken, or not paid this vow. Yea, farther, we vow it as our belief, that we are, and will continue sinful and insufficient for any duty to our life's end; and that to our dying moment we shall need to wash in the blood of Jesus. But we vow that the aid promised is sufficient to enable us to perform all duties.

5th. Some are afraid of mocking and reproach, if they would make such an appearance on the side of Religion. If the words of Christ—"of him will I be ashamed before my father and his holy angels"—do not balance the weight of their objection; to them I have nothing to say.

6th. And last, some may be afraid that they are too young. But if they have "knowledge and understanding," this cannot be. The younger, with these requisites, it is the more honourable to God, and beyond all controversy, the more happy for themselves. "Him that honoureth me I will honour."—While it more fully disposes the heart for all social duties, it increases all social and temporal comfort. But what is incomparably more excellent, inasmuch as it might be a cutting short of the corruptions of the heart it might give grace an ascendancy, and bring the soul into a measure of experience and holy joy, which, but for this, it would have never known. And assuredly it will not grieve you, my dear friends, to reflect at the solemn hour of your departure, that the morning of your days was devoted to him into whose presence you are about to enter. To what are you here invited? Is it not to bear your weakness on the arm of omnipotence? Is it not to go up through this wilderness so pregnant with sorrows, so full of dangers, snares and death, leaning upon the beloved of your souls? Is it not to sit down under his shadow, who is an hiding place from the storm, and a covert from the tempest; who is the chief among ten thousand, yea altogether lovely.

O, taste and see that there is a blessed, a soul ravishing delight in near fellowship with God. Come to the Fountain of living waters, and drink abundantly, and they will spring up to your everlasting consolation, when every human cistern has run dry. I earnestly beseech you all to consider that the opportunities of this duty are of very rare occurrence. Seldom twice to the same

person through his whole life. If an opportunity is offered you, it may be the last, the only one to you, beware of letting it pass with a slight consideration. Let nothing hold you back but what you can plead at a Judgment Seat. Ponder it deeply in your hearts. Scrutinize all your motives, both for and against it. Bring all to the test of the word. Make it the subject of many prayers. And now may the God of peace that brought again from the dead our Lord Jesus, that great Shepherd of the sheep, through the blood of the everlasting covenant make you perfect in *every good work to do his will*, working in you that which is well pleasing in his sight, through Jesus Christ, to whom be glory for ever and ever. Amen.

Ne rogites quisnam, sed quidnam scripserit, auctor. Please don't inquire who is the author, but examine what he hath written.

ON THE DIVINITY OF CHRIST.

DISSERTATION II.

The truth of the doctrine proved from John i. 1, 2,—“In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. The same was in the beginning with God.”

PART III.—SEC. 1.

HAVING proved, in opposition to the perverse disputings of the ancient Sabellians and modern Unitarians, that there is a distinction of persons in the Divine Nature, by showing that the account of the Word cannot be applied to the Father or the eternal Spirit; it is necessary to place the same guard upon the glorious gospel of God our Saviour against the Arians, who make their assault another way; not denying the distinction but the equality of the Divine persons. The reverse is taught by John: For, as he saith, "the Word was with God," viz. the Father, as to his person, so he adds, "the Word was God," i. e. as to his nature. One justly observes "that it is with God's cause as it was with his people, 'there are Syrians before and Philistines behind, and they devour Israel with open mouth.' 'The spirit that now works in the children of disobedience is always the same, a liar from the beginning,' and so he will be to the end. But he has not kept to one form of opposition, in his enmity to the truth of God. He is forced to be often shifting hands and changing his schemes." It may not, therefore, be improper, when entering upon this branch of the subject, to present the reader with some of the opinions of those who make opposition to the supreme Deity of our glorious Redeemer. Thus a certain au-

thor, as quoted by Bradbury, has delivered his thoughts in these propositions—That

“With the Father, who is the first and supreme cause, there has existed, from the beginning, a second person, who is his Word and Son; and with the Father and the Son there has existed from the beginning a third Divine person, who is the Spirit of the Father and the Son. That the Father alone is self-existent, underived, unoriginated, and independent. That the Father is the sole original of all power and authority, and is the author and principle of whatever is done by the Son or by the Spirit: and that the Scripture, when it mentions one God, or the only God, always means the Supreme person of the Father. That the Son, or second person, is not self-existent, but derives his being, or essence, and all his attributes from the Father, as from the supreme cause.”

In the next proposition he distinguisheth himself from the *Arians*, and from those that I hope we may be allowed to call *orthodox*. “They, saith he, are worthy of censure who either on the one hand, presume to affirm that the Son was made out of nothing, or on the other hand, that he is a self-existent being.” And the ground of this critical peculiarity, he lays down thus—“That the Scripture, in declaring the Son’s derivation from the Father, never makes mention of any limitation of time, but always supposes and affirms him to have existed with the Father from the beginning, and before all worlds. They are also justly to be censured, who, presuming to be *wise above what is written*, and intrude into things which they have not seen, presume to affirm that there was a time when the Son was not.” Others have lighted their candles at this author’s; but as they do not write with his caution, it will be very hard for them to keep clear of his censure. We are told by one, “that the Word, or the Logos, was an intelligent agent, or a being distinct from God the Father. And that to assert he was the same being with the Father, is to assert that he was the Father.” And again, “that Christ is not represented in the Scripture as equal to God, and that the same absolute perfections are not ascribed to Christ which are to the Father.” “I hope the contrary to this has appeared from a collection of Scriptures such as all the adversaries in the world will not be able to gainsay or resist.”*

A certain author of the *present age*, with regard to one personal glory of the Son, delivers himself in the following proposition:

*Bradbury’s Sermon on the Mystery of Godliness, pp. 752, 753. 755.

“The glory peculiar to him as the only begotten Son of the Father. Solomon tells us ‘that the glory of children are their parents.’ The Jews fully aware of this, gloried much in having Abraham, the friend of God, for their father. Consider Jehovah the father of Jesus Christ: he is the Lord of glory, the fountain of all excellence. His whole proceedings are entirely worthy of his august character. What an honour to be the Son of such a Father. Thus Christ felt and took peculiar delight in approaching and addressing God in the character of his own father!” Horesco referens! I transcribe with horror! Do not these sentences chill the reader’s blood, and set him a shivering? But let us return to the beloved subject, and in opposition to all these gross errors and horrid blasphemies, ancient or modern, establish the supreme deity of the great God our Saviour, from the Holy Scriptures.

The language of John is as plain as can be: he saith the Word was God. Several reasons have been given why the title *Word* must be understood of no other than the second person of the three that bear record in heaven. And thus the text will support our belief of a distinction among them. Let us go on with the same liberty and impartiality into another inquiry, if the text will also support our belief that Christ is a divine person?

In opening this argument for our Lord’s divinity, let us examine fairly, if the name God, when applied to Christ, is to be understood in a lower and inferior sense, as when it is applied to creatures; or if it is expressive of a divine nature, and includes all those perfections which are contained in the title “I AM.”

Sec. 2. Some account of the lower sense of the title *God*, in the Holy Scriptures.

In order to clear the road, and prevent digressions, in answering the objections and exceptions of the adversaries, it may be proper to mention the lower sense of the title God, or the limitation with which it is sometimes to be understood in the Bible.

1st. Some are gods by the choice of those who make them so: they are the work of men’s hands, and their makers are like unto them, stupid and undefended. Paul declared to the Athenians “that we ought not to think that the Godhead is like unto gold, or silver, or stone, graven by art and man’s device.” They changed the glory of the incorruptible God into that which eateth grass. “Professing themselves to be wise, they became fools.” “The residue of what

he has burnt in the fire he makes a god, even his graven image, he falls down and worships it, and saith, deliver me for thou art my God: they have not known, nor understood, for he hath shut their eyes that they cannot see, and their hearts that they cannot understand." And in this age when Popery is spreading, and enthusiasm so much abounds; it is worth while to observe that the idolatry is only a little more refined, when people frame to themselves an intellectual image of deities in the heavens, though they do not carve or paint them upon earth. "The notion," says one, "is as wild, though not so wooden. I would no more fall down to St. Ignatius, or St. Thomas, or Becket, than I would to Mars, Bacchus, or Appollo. The canonizations at Delphos are as good to me as those at Rome. There are, as the apostle saith, 'lords many and gods many;' but to us there is no more than *one God*." These idolators pretend, indeed, that they do not worship the image. But observe, first, they worship in a manner directly opposite to the express command of God—"Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image." And, secondly, it is destructive of that worship which is by faith; because a faith in God presents him to the soul, in all the perfections of his nature, in all the promises of his gospel, and in all the demands of his law,—“He that cometh to God must believe that he is, and that he is the rewarder of them that diligently seek him.”

From this note, we may lead on to the reader's contempt of a subordinate worship.—Neither of them pretend to worship an idol, or a creature with any more than subordinate devotion. But none ever talked of subordinate worship, but they who talked of subordinate gods. And are we to speak of Christ, concerning whom the voice of heaven is, “Worship him all ye gods,” and Christ himself saith, “that all men should honour the Son, even as they honour the Father,” no other wise than we do of these imaginary deities? “Are we beholden to the people who do service to these, that by nature are no gods, for our vindication in bowing the knee, and confessing with the tongue ‘that Jesus is Lord?’ Shall the vain gabbling of the heathen be brought in as an improvement upon our religion?” Is not the command of God express, as Christ himself declares, “Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him *only* shalt thou serve?”

2d. There are gods by office, or appointment: “He called them gods to whom the

word of God came.” But, as they were all mortal, so many of them were wicked gods, a scandal to the title. “God standeth in the congregation of the mighty, he judgeth among the gods: how long will ye judge unjustly, and accept the persons of the wicked? They know not, neither will they understand, they walk on in darkness, all the foundations are out of course; I said ye are gods, and all of you children of the Most High:” But that makes them neither *sacred* nor *secure*, for “they shall die like men, and fall like one of the princes.” “And therefore as the title of god by office is laid down with so much contempt, let us not talk of him in that way, who is the blessed and only Potentate, the King of kings and Lord of lords. The names of these titular gods are taken up in a curse, but let his name be as ointment poured forth.”

That the Son was appointed by the Father to the office of Mediator, is plain enough, from his own declarations,—“I was set up, and consecrated from everlasting;” and again, “the Father sanctified and sent the Son into the world.” But here observe, first—“inequality of office does not exclude equality of nature. A King's son is of the same nature with his father, though he may be employed by him in an inferior office. He that is less than his father, as to the work of mediation, being the father's servant therein, is equal to him as his Son, as God to be blessed forever.”* Secondly, the appointment of the Son to the work of mediation, necessarily supposes his Divine nature. If he were not God, he could not have engaged with an infinite offended majesty, whose law we had broken, and to whose wrath we were liable: he must be God that he might purchase the church with his own blood: and as he is placed at the head of an empire as great as the whole universe, “all things are put under his feet:” this is too much for the most exalted creature. And, Thirdly, when he saith, “All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth,” the worship that was paid unto him on that occasion, proves that he is God.—“As man, he was not equal to God in nature; as mediator, he was not equal to him in place, but appeared ‘in the form of a servant.’ But in the existence that he had before he took upon him our nature, ‘he thought it not robbery to be equal with God.’”

3d. Those are gods who are so called from their influence over mankind. Whe-

* Owen's Vind. Evan. p. 188.

ther they get their authority from usurpation, or any other way, from this they have their title. But here observe, that when the word *god* is applied to rulers, it does not at all determine the right of the person. Saith God himself, "They have set up kings but not by me." The title does not make the men sacred, or their government irresistible, because Satan himself is called "the god of this world," but this gives him no title to exercise universal empire, nor does it supercede the authority of Christ to resist him.

When we affirm that the word God is applied to Christ, they insult us with this answer—"So the devil is called god, and will you therefore worship him?" But it is easy to observe, that the name is given to him on account of the influence he has upon those that give such answers. "If our gospel be hid, it is hid to them that are lost, in whom the god of this world has blinded the minds of them that believe not, lest the light of the glorious gospel of Christ should shine into them."

4th. Some creatures are called gods from the dignity and excellency of their natures. And these are the elect angels. "Worship him all ye gods." But, though the angels have the name, they have not the nature of God. And therefore, there is a great difference between the deity who is the object of worship, and the one who gives it. The apostle exhorts against worshipping of angels. And though one of them had shown the apostle John all the glories of the "New Jerusalem," yet he blames him because he fell down to worship him: "See," saith he, "thou do it not, for I am thy fellow servant, and of thy brethren the prophets, worship thou God." Now if Christ had not been God, he would not have received worship which was refused by this angel. And therefore he must not be considered merely as a servant, but equal with the Father, as God. In addition to all these particulars, it may be observed,

5th. That the name God is one of the greatest titles of Deity. To say that it only "signifies the relation that he stands in to his creatures, and that the word imports no more than dominion," is an insult both upon reason and Revelation. Saith Moses, "In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth." Is it not evident that He, who is there spoken of, had a being before these heavens and this earth? And this is correspondent to what Moses records in his prayer, "Before the mountains were brought forth, or ever thou hadst formed the earth, from everlasting to ever-

lasting, thou art God;" conformably to what Moses declares, John saith, "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. The same was in the beginning with God. All things were made by him, and without him was not any thing made that was made." Is it to be supposed that God would give us a revelation relative to his decrees, his worship, and his works; and yet not one word in all that book expressive of his own absolute perfections? You see what a wild unhappy chase we are led into by those who deny the Divinity of our dear Lord. We thought the only question was, whether or no *He* is spoken of as the supreme God: but here is a new start of imagination, whether the word God be a supreme nature: so that we are not disputing about the application of the word, but the meaning of it, which was supposed to be clear enough to all religion, both natural and revealed. What will these men bring us to at last? How long shall vain thoughts lodge within them? When we ask them if Christ is a creature, their answer is so mysterious that though they mean this they dare but mumble it. Well, we think there is but one negative upon his Deity, and therefore if they will not call him a creature, they cannot be angry that we call him a God. Here, they are masters of reason indeed; that is, they have got the better of it, and throw the same contempt upon philosophy that they do upon Revelation, by telling us of a medium between a God and a creature.

When, by the affluence of all the learning, language, maxims, and arguments of the world, we bear down this peculiar cant, and show them that no people ever talked as they do; they are at us with another singularity, that the word *god* itself, which we have contended for, and they have pleaded against, does not signify the underived perfections of him that has it, but is purely a relative term. So that not only Christ has lost his name, but the name has lost its meaning; and with such robberies do they make their burnt offerings.*

6th. Notwithstanding all that has been said of the different applications of the name *god*, it is certain there is but "one God." And therefore the communication of the title ought to be regarded with the greatest caution. No perfections of the Divine nature go along with it. This is the language of all true religion—"The Lord our

* Bradbury.

God is one Lord." He alone is the possessor of "immortality." "We know that there is no idol in this world, and there is no other gods besides one." So that it is evident, though God has been pleased to allow the title, it is with such limitations that it must never signify, in any other, that which it does in himself, a supremacy of power or a claim to worship. The angels have the name with an eminence above every other creature, and though they "excel in strength, they *obey* his commandments, fulfil his pleasure, and *hearken* to the voice of his word." Nor dare any of them take the homage with the title. One of them would not let "John fall down before him," but saith, in a peremotory manner,—"See thou do it not, for I am thy fellow servant, and of thy brethren the prophets: worship God."

Thus it is evident, that though God has suffered his creatures to wear his *titles*, he will not suffer them to share with him in his *honour*. Both angels and men have suffered when they pretended to this. "Lucifer the son of the morning said, I will be like the Most High: I will exalt my throne above the stars of God," and thus being "lifted up with pride" he fell into that which is called "the condemnation of the devil." And thus it fared with our first parents: they presumed to be as gods; upon that, "he drove out the man." So it has been with particular tyrants. Nebuchadnezzar by raising himself to be a god, was thrown down into a beast, to live and feed as they do, in their manner, and perhaps in their company. The king of Tyrus had his "heart lifted up, and said, I am a God, I sit in the seat of God, and he had set his heart as the heart of God." But his pride was to be humbled. "Wilt thou say yet before him that slays thee, I am a God? But thou shalt be a man, and no God, in the hand of him that slays thee." Thus the man of sin, the son of perdition, "opposes and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped; so that he, as God, sitteth in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God. This wicked one will the Lord consume with the spirit of his mouth, and destroy with the brightness of his coming." "From hence we may conclude, that whoever is called by the name of God, and *upon that*, makes a demand of religious worship, must either be the Supreme being, or an usurper. Would Christ, being a man, make himself equal with God, if he had not the same infinite and eternal nature? But, when he rose

again from the dead, it was said *of* him, "Worship him all ye gods," and *to* him, "Thy throne, O God, is forever and ever." This proves, against all gainsaying, that Christ is infinitely greater than those who are called gods, either from their office, or the dignity of a derived and dependent nature.

The candid reader will easily perceive the necessity and propriety of enlarging so fully and particularly upon this branch of the subject. The adversaries of the Divinity of Christ tell us, that angels, and governors are called gods: so Christ is God by the Father's appointment. That the name *god* is to be understood with a limitation, in many scriptures, is not only confessed but proved. But would it not be very dangerous to say, that the word God never once in the Bible signifies the Supreme Being? And when it is taken in a subordinate sense, the Holy Ghost has always taken care not to lead us astray. "There was no danger of leading us into any idolatry, in his calling kings by the name of god, because he adds in the same breath, 'they shall fall like men,' and speaks of their death as a punishment. Nay, though the glory of an angel's person might be insnaring to us, yet the dignity of his title is not: for when they are called upon, 'Worship him all ye gods,' we are led to consider them as depending creatures." But, are there any drawbacks in the language of the Evangelist, when he saith, "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God"? Doth he not fully explain himself, and confirm the Divinity of Christ, by declaring "all things were made by him, and without him was not any thing made that was made;" and again, "In him was life, and the life was the light of men." And again, when he speaks of him as a distinct person, he saith, "The Word was made flesh and dwelt among us, and we beheld his glory, the glory of the only begotten of the Father." This is correspondent to what Paul declares—"He is the brightness of his glory, and the express character of his substance."

PART III.—SEC. 1.

As by the name *God*, John expresseth the Divine nature, so all the perfections peculiar to that nature are, in the Scriptures, attributed to Christ: therefore he is the Supreme God.

There is no room to dispute the fact, that John ascribes the name *God* to the Word; that is, to Christ. For any to drive in their

arrogant distinctions between a supreme and derived God, a self-existent and originated deity, is to be wise above what is written, and shows that he is vainly puffed up in his fleshly mind. If John had known of a God that had no beginning, and a God that had one, he would have kept the characters clear and never run us into the hazard of confounding the one with the other; especially as he wrote his gospel to prove the Divinity of Christ, and gives such a distinct and particular account of his person and speeches, of his miracles and works. The Arians tell us "that the Son is both above and before the creation, yet there was a time when he *was not*: that he was not *in* the beginning, but after the beginning: that the Father produced him by a voluntary act.

Dr. Watts, in his Arian invited to Orthodox Faith, saith—"May we not suppose the Logos, or Word, considered as something in the Godhead, analagous to a power or virtue, to be infinite, uncreated, co-essential, and co-eternal with God the Father, as being of his very essence, true God? May not this sometimes be represented in a personal manner, as distinct from the Father? May we not suppose also, that in some *unknown moment* of the *divine eternity*, God by his sovereign will and power, produced a glorious Spirit in an immediate manner, and in a very near likeness to himself, and called him *his Son*, his only begotten Son?" From these sentences it may be observed, First, that it is very surprising that one who published a Treatise on Logick, should talk of *moments* in the divine eternity: and, Secondly, what mortal can depend upon what he saith, when the author himself confesseth his own ignorance, by acknowledging that the *moment* of the divine eternity is *unknown*: and, Thirdly, the whole scheme is built upon a supposition. "May we not suppose," saith he. In this he differs very much from Solomon: that wise man saith—"Have I not written to thee excellent things in counsel and knowledge, that I might make thee know the *certainty* of the words of truth; that thou mightest answer the words of truth to them that send unto thee?" Prov. xxii. 20, 21. And Paul declares, "My speech and my preaching was not with the enticing words of man's wisdom, but in demonstration of the Spirit, and of power; that your faith should not stand in the *wisdom of men*, but in the power of God." 1 Cor. ii. 4, 5.

Thus, "Some condemn the Arians for talking of any time when *the Son was not*. They allow him to be eternal, and yet de-

rived; to have received a beginning, and always to have had it; to have proper deity, without independence; divine perfections, and yet not absolute sovereignty; that he has divinity in *some* of its distinctions, and yet not with *all its essentials*: that is, they will pretend to adjust the rights of empire between Father and Son. But where has the Most High called them thus to divide the inheritance of unsearchable glory? May it not be said, 'vain man would be wise'?"

The Socinians, or if they please, Unitarians, are fairer adversaries than these people, though no less enemies to the truth, because they speak plain, we can understand what they mean. They assert that Christ is no more than a man divinely inspired, and deny that he had any existence before *that* in the womb of the Virgin Mary. We do not find that their notion goes any higher than what the apostle tells us his very enemies had of him,—"Ye men of Israel, Jesus of Nazareth was a man approved among you by signs, and miracles, and wonders, which God did by him in the midst of you, as ye yourselves also know." Acts ii. 22. But, saith Dr. Owen, "We deny that the human nature of Christ had any such subsistence of its own, as to give it a *proper personality*, being from the time of its conception, assumed into subsistence with the Son of God." And again, "the divine nature of Christ had its *own personality* antecedent to this union: nor is the union of his person the union of the several parts of the same nature, but the concurrence of several natures in one subsistence."

Though the Socinians, or Unitarians, affirm that Christ is only a man divinely inspired, yet they confess that the highest titles of Deity are attributed to him. They concur in calling him "God, the mighty God, the great God our *Saviour*, and God over all blessed forever." But the explanation they give us of all these texts, sucks out the glory of them. They maintain that he is a God not by nature, but by the Father's appointment—thus a god by office. But the gross absurdity of this notion has been so fully proved in the preceding Part, Sec. 2, that it is unnecessary again to rush into the argument.

We read in Dr. Owen, "He that 'was in the beginning,' before the creation of the world, before 'any thing' of all things that 'are made,' was made, who was then with God, and was God, who 'made all things, and without whom nothing was made;' in

* Bradbury.

whom 'was life,' he is God by nature, blessed forever: nor is there in the whole Scripture a more glorious and eminent description of God, by his attributes, name, and works, than here is given of him, concerning whom all these things are spoken: but now all this is affirmed of the 'Word that was made flesh,' that is confessedly of 'Jesus Christ,' therefore he is God by nature blessed forever."*

The Messiah was called *Word* by the Jews. The Chaldee Paraphrasts, the most ancient writers among the Jews, generally make use of the word *Mamre*, which signifies Word, in those places where God puts the name Jehovah. And it is generally thought, that in this term, the Paraphrasts would intimate the Son of God, the second person of the Trinity. Now their testimony is so much the more considerable, as having lived before the time of Christ; they are irrefragable witnesses of the sentiments of their nation concerning this article; since the Targum, or Chaldee paraphrase has always been, and still is, in universal esteem among the Jews. And as this ascribes to Mamre, or Word, all the attributes of deity, it is concluded from thence that they believed the divinity of the Word. They say it was Mamre, or the Word, which created the world, and appeared to Moses on mount Sinai, &c. And as the other Evangelists in the beginning of their gospels, speak of Christ as to his human nature, and give us an account of his nativity as the Son of man; John opens his in a more lofty manner, by leading our thoughts above the springs of time and nature, in giving us an account of his divinity.

MR. EDITOR,—

I have read, with interest, the "Letters on the Introduction and Progress of Unitarianism in New-England," republished in the Religious Monitor. The subject is of immense importance. I trust it will appear, in the course of the Letters, that the writer has done it justice. And, while it would gratify the friends of truth to see the true causes, and all the causes, of that overwhelming error fully developed, they must, nevertheless, regret to see any of the doctrines of God's word represented as the cause. In No. 3,† the introduction of foreign books is mentioned as one cause. The writings of Whitby and Taylor, are said to have scattered the seeds of Arminianism in New-

England. It is next said that the works of Hervey and Marshall inculcated those views of faith which Brainard and Bellamy so strenuously opposed. The writer seems here to have deviated from his usual candour. He brings a heavy charge, without any specification, against men who have ably and pointedly defended the doctrine which it is insinuated in the Letters that they have contributed to subvert. The *divinity* of the Son and the Holy Spirit, are fundamental doctrines, conspicuously running through all the writings of these two eminent divines. The common rules of justice would have required the author of these Letters, to have given some intimation, however brief, of the peculiar views of faith, if unsound, advocated by Hervey and Marshall, and opposed by Brainard and Bellamy. And, if it was not evident, the writer should have shown in what way these views tended to advance the cause of Unitarianism. For, with those of your readers who are conversant with, and approve of the views of faith presented in the Standards of the churches, both of Scotland and England, the names of Hervey and Marshall will be considered of more weight than those of Brainard and Bellamy. And the writer of the Letters gives his readers no other evidence that the doctrines advocated by the two former, had a tendency to advance the cause of Unitarianism, than, that they were opposed by the two latter. The peculiar views of the merits and efficacy of the atonement, which the Arminian system embraces, may, indeed, not very indirectly lead to Unitarianism; because that system does not seem to rest the whole efficacy of the atonement sufficiently upon the infinite merits of the person of the Redeemer. And the same might also be said of the Hopkinsian system, which denies a particular and definite atonement. But, I am persuaded that the views of faith advocated by Hervey and Marshall are, in their tendency, directly opposed to the advancement of Unitarianism. For, notwithstanding the opposition of Messrs. Brainard and Bellamy, I trust that it will appear to any one who will candidly and carefully examine the writings of Hervey and Marshall, that their views of faith are Scriptural. Consequently, the true causes which favored the introduction of Unitarianism into New-England, must be found somewhere else than in their writings, whatever the writings of the others may have done. If it would not occupy too much room, I would suggest the publication, in connexion with this subject, of one of the late venerated Dr. Anderson's Letters, in vindication of the doctrines set forth in the writings of these eminent men, against the attacks of Bellamy and others.

Yours, &c.

A READER.

* Dr. Owen's Vind. Evan. p. 207.

† See Rel. Mon. vol. vii. p. 432.

On the appropriation which is in the nature of Saving Faith.

CHRISTIAN BROTHERS,—

Mr. Bellamy inveighs with great severity against Mr. Marshal, Mr. Hervey, and others, for teaching that the language of the direct act of faith is to this purpose, I believe, upon the footing of the gospel promise, "that the Lord Christ is my Saviour, and that I shall have life through his name: that the Lord is my God in Christ, my light and my salvation." Persons, according to him, cannot use such expressions, without presumption, till they have found, by self-examination, the sincerity of their faith and repentance. Such, he allows, was the language of assurance commonly used by the saints recorded in Scripture. But, then, says he, "they had sufficient evidence of their good state by their sanctification. This was their evidence; they knew no other."

Mr. Bellamy's opinion, then, on supposition that it is contradictory to that of Mr. Marshal and Mr. Hervey, (and to say that it is not so, is to charge Mr. Bellamy with gross calumny,) must be, that no person, without reflection on his good qualifications or inherent righteousness, can have any well grounded belief that Jesus Christ is his own Saviour.

In order to form a right judgment of this matter, we must attend carefully to the representation which the Holy Scripture gives of saving faith, as distinguished from the other graces of the Spirit. In the first place, it may be observed, that the words by which *faith* is expressed in the languages wherein the Scripture was first written, are such as certainly imply *persuasion*. Mr. Bellamy ought to have taken notice of what is urged to this purpose by the authors whose doctrine he undertakes to confute. "This notion," says one of these authors, "of assurance or persuasion in faith is so agreeable to the nature of the thing called *believing*, and to the style of the Holy Scriptures, that sometimes when the original text reads faith or believing, we read in our translation assurance, according to the genuine sense of the original phrase; Acts xvii. 31—"Whereof he hath given *assurance* to all men that he hath raised him from the dead;" in the original, *faith*, as is noted in the margin of our Bibles. Deut. xviii. 66—"Thou shalt have none *assurance* of thy life;" in the original, "Thou shalt not *believe* in thy life." This observation shows, that to believe, in the style of the Holy Scriptures, as well as in the common usage of mankind in all other matters, is to be assured or persuaded,

namely, according to the measure of such believing."* "Budeus and Stephens," says Mr. Hervey, "derive the Greek word rendered faith, from another word in that language, which signifies, He is persuaded; and I think they do so very properly; for whatever we believe, of that, we have a real persuasion. The interpretation which Stephens, one of the most accurate critics of the Greek language, gives of the word in the New Testament, rendered *faith*, is, that it is a persuasion which the Holy Spirit works in us of salvation promised in Christ, which a person applies to himself in believing." George Pason, in his Lexicon for the New Testament, observes, concerning the word rendered to believe, "That in profane authors, it is used for trusting, depending, placing confidence in a person or thing. He who believes in Jesus Christ holds him not only to be the Saviour of the elect, but his own Saviour, placing all his hope and confidence in him. Whosoever does not adhere to Jesus Christ by faith, and to God in him, remains in the kingdom of Satan, and is spiritually dead."

In the second place, it may be observed, that a real persuasion of our warrant to rest on Jesus Christ as our own Saviour, not only belongs to the nature of saving faith, but serves to distinguish it from the other graces of the Spirit. Mr. Bellamy himself allows, "that there is in saving faith an entire dependence for acceptance with God on the free grace of God through Jesus Christ, as exhibited in the written Word."† It is true he, at the same time, sets this *dependence* in opposition to the *confidence* which Mr. Marshal and others put in their definition of saving faith. But Mr. Bellamy had no warrant from the holy Scriptures to represent these expressions as opposite to one another. On the contrary, believing and trusting, faith and confidence, are used indifferently for one another. Thus, *confiding* or *trusting*, in Ps. ii. 12, is parallel to *believing* in Mark xvi. 16. What we are exhorted to in Prov. iii. 5, "*confide* or *trust* in the Lord with all thine heart," is parallel to that which is affirmed in Rom. x. 10—"With the heart man believeth unto righteousness." In Ps. lxxviii. 2, believing in God is explained by trusting in his salvation. Believing is expressed in other places by relying, staying, leaning on the Lord; 2 Chron. xiii. 18, and xvi. 7. Isa. i. 10. Song viii. 5. As fear and doubting are op-

* See Mr. Boston's Notes on the Marrow of Modern Divinity, Chap. ii. Sec. 3.

† Dialogue ii. page 80.

posed to confidence, so they are to believing: Mark v. 36—"Be not afraid, only believe."

Knowledge, or some competent understanding of the truths of the gospel, and a *speculative assent* to these truths, belongs to historical and temporary faith, as well as to saving faith. It requires, therefore, something else to constitute the faith of God's elect. Some judicious divines have said, that a cordial approbation of God's way of saving sinners by Jesus Christ, to the praise of the glory of his grace, is the true spiritual notion of justifying faith. And it is certain, that such an approbation is always included in the exercise of saving faith: yet it may be questioned whether our approbation of God's way of saving sinners, exclusive of his application of his salvation to ourselves, will sufficiently characterize true faith, or distinguish it from every other gracious or spiritual exercise; since it is obvious that the notion of believing or trusting in a person or thing, is different from that of approving that person or thing. Besides, it is evident that any holy, rational creature, such as an angel, must approve of God's way of saving sinners by Jesus Christ; though his case neither requires nor admits the same faith or dependence on that salvation with the case of sinners. Nor is faith, formally considered, our turning from sin to God; which, under the name of repentance, is properly distinguished from faith, in our Shorter Catechism. The saving graces, which the Holy Spirit works in the hearts of true Christians, are inseparable; yet he teacheth us to distinguish them from one another. He teacheth us particularly to distinguish saving faith from all the other graces, by the peculiar designations he gives it, and by the peculiar office he assigns to it. He calls it our receiving the testimony of God concerning his Son, our coming to Christ, our leaning on him. He assigns to faith, and not to love, repentance, or any other grace, the office of receiving the righteousness of Christ for our justification. The simple account, which our old Reformers used to give, of the formal nature of saving faith, however much despised by their Popish adversaries, or by degenerate Protestants, was scriptural, and served well to distinguish faith from every other gracious act or habit. The formal nature of saving faith, according to them, is a sure trust in the Lord Jesus Christ, or a fiducial dependence on him for all our salvation; a trust that he is and will be our atoning and interceding High Priest, our teaching Prophet,

our sin-subduing king. The Psalmist speaks the language of this faith, when he says,—“The Lord is my high tower and my deliverer, my shield, and he in whom I trust;” that is, as Mr. Hervey justly observes, “Of this I am well persuaded; and therefore I trust in him! or this I believe, and, in so doing, I trust in him.”

Thus, when the writers whom Mr. Belamy opposes, spoke of our having a real persuasion “that Christ is ours,” they meant no more than a fiducial dependence on the Lord Jesus Christ for all our salvation. Indeed, such a persuasion cannot well be denied to be the native import of this dependence. When we trust in a person, or depend on him for doing us a favor, we are persuaded that he will do it. Nor have we any more dependence on him than we have of this persuasion.

Mr. Marshal proves, that by saving faith we appropriate Christ to ourselves, as our own Saviour, for such reasons as the following:

First: an argument for this truth arises from the evils to which true faith is opposed; among which are staggering, (Rom. iv. 20,) wavering, (Heb. x. 23,) doubting, (Matt. xiv. 31,) fear, (Mark v. 36.) These contraries serve greatly to illustrate the nature of faith, and to show that believing must have some confidence in it; otherwise it would have doubting and fear in its very nature. For what man, that understandeth the preciousness of his immortal soul, and his danger of losing it, can ever avoid fear, doubting, and trouble of heart, by any believing whereby he doth not at all assure himself of salvation?

In the next place, the right manner of trusting and hoping in the Lord, after the examples recorded in Scripture, is by assuring ourselves against all fears and doubtings, that the Lord is our God, and that he is become our salvation: Ps. xxxi. 14—"I trusted in thee, O Lord; I said, thou art my God." Ps. xviii. 2—"The Lord is my rock and my fortress and my deliverer, my God, my strength, in whom I will trust." Isa. xii. 2—"Behold, God is my salvation, I will trust and not be afraid." Ps. xlii. 11—"O my soul—hope thou in God—for I shall yet praise him, who is the health of my countenance, and my God."

Farther—That the direct act of faith, by which we are justified and saved, assures of salvation, appears from the titles and attributes given to it in Scripture. It is “the substance of things hoped for, and the evidence of things not seen.” Heb. xi. 1. It

sels the great things of our salvation hoped for, evidently before the eyes of our mind, as if they were already present in their substance, though not, as yet, visible to our bodily eyes. That faith whereby we are partakers of Christ, and become his house, must be worthy to be called *confidence*, and must be accompanied with the rejoicing of hope. Heb. iii. 6. 14. In Heb. x. 22, we are exhorted to *draw near to God with a true heart, in full assurance* of faith.—Many apply this text to that which they call the reflex act of faith; because they imagine that all assurance must needs be by reflection. But the words of the text clearly teach us to understand it of that act of faith whereby we draw near to God, that is the direct act; and it is that very faith by which the just liveth. This assurance must be full, in the true and proper nature of it, in opposition to mere doubtfulness; though we are yet farther to labour for that which is full in the highest degree of perfection. In James i. 6, 7, we are expressly required to ask good things of God, *in faith, nothing doubting*; which manifestly includeth assurance; and he tells us plainly, that, without it *a man ought not to think that he shall receive any thing of the Lord*. Therefore we may firmly conclude, that, without it, we shall not receive the salvation of Christ. And that which the apostle James requireth us not to doubt of, is, the obtaining of the things which we ask; as we may learn from an instruction to the same purpose, given by Christ himself, Mark xi. 24—"Whatsoever things ye desire, when ye pray, believe that ye receive them, and ye shall have them."

Again, if we be altogether in a state of suspense and doubting whether God will be pleased to give Christ to us or not, it is evident that our souls are quite loose from Christ, and have no holdfast or enjoyment of him as our only salvation and happiness. We do not, in that case, as much as pretend to any actual receiving or laying hold of him; but are rather still to seek whether we have any good ground or right to lay hold of him. Can a woman honestly receive any one as her husband, while she is not assured that he is fully willing to be her husband?

The same thing may be said concerning the several parts of Christ's salvation, which are to be received by faith. For example, we do not actually receive into our hearts our reconciliation with God, and adoption of children, and the title to an everlasting inheritance, until we can assure ourselves that God is graciously pleased to be our God and

Father, and to take us to be his children and heirs. If we do not assuredly believe that we are dead to sin, and alive to God through Christ; that we are risen with Christ; that we are not under the law, but under grace; that we are members of Christ's body, temples of the Holy Ghost, and the dear children of God; it would be hypocrisy to affect to serve God on account of such privileges, as if we reckoned ourselves partakers of them. And is it not a miserable, worthless kind of faith, which cannot fit a believer to practise in a gospel manner, upon the most pure and powerful principles of grace, but rather leaves him to work upon legal principles; such as, the justice and wrath of God against sinners, and his mercy towards those who perform the condition of sincere obedience? A faith, we may add, which faileth in the very matter of some great duties which are of such a nature, that they include assurance of God's love in the right performance of them; such as the great duties of peace with God, rejoicing in the Lord always, hope that maketh not ashamed; owning the Lord as our God and Saviour; praying to him as our Father in heaven; offering up body and soul as an acceptable sacrifice to him, casting all our cases of body and soul upon him; contentment and hearty thanksgiving in every condition; making our boast in the Lord; triumphing in his praise; rejoicing in tribulation; putting on Christ in our baptism; receiving Christ's body as broken for us, and his blood as shed for us, in the Lord's Supper; committing our souls willingly to God, as our Redeemer, when he shall be pleased to call for us; loving Christ's second appearance, and looking for it, as that blessed hope.

A reader who expects to find these, and other arguments offered by Mr. Marshall on this subject, fairly stated and answered in Mr. Bellamy's work, will be utterly disappointed. He takes notice, indeed, of one or two of the texts from which Mr. Marshall reasons. On Heb. xi. 1, he observes, that, "If the word of God gives a sinner, out of Christ, no absolute unconditional right to the blessings of the gospel; faith cannot see what is not, nor believe without evidence." Here he only denies Mr. Marshall's doctrine about the freeness of a sinner's right of access to Christ, (which doctrine we propose to consider afterwards,) but says nothing against Mr. Marshall's remark, that the apostle's expressions in this text carry in them an appropriation of the good things not seen. It is plain that a

person
text, v
prehen
the ce
expres
or con
ed in
which
Wi
says—
what
pel, c
in the
Priest
swer
up to
to be
ed."
when
wrou
and,
thing
sinne
will
these
faith
it is
whic
shall
obtai
that
ther
obse
C
follo
ples
mira
God
that
vat
to
for
sav
tha
an
ot
th
ce
w
H
"
a
s
a
t
i
e
b
c
l

person who has the faith described in this text, views the things which that faith apprehends as things for which he hopes; and the certainty of his expectation of them is expressed by emphatical words, *substance* or *confidence*, (as the same word is rendered in chap. iii. 6, of this book,) and *evidence* which produces full conviction.

With regard to James i. 6, Mr. Bellamy says—"To ask in faith: In the faith of what? Of the truths revealed in the gospel, concerning the way of access to God, in the name of Christ, as our great High Priest, and God's readiness to hear and answer all requests agreeable to his will, put up to him in his name. These truths ought to be—these truths must be, firmly believed." But Mr. Bellamy could not deny that, when a person has the faith of these truths wrought in his heart by the Holy Spirit, and, in the exercise of that faith, asks such things as God hath promised to give poor sinners for Christ's sake; such a person will believe that he shall certainly receive these things of the Lord. This being the faith in which the apostle directs us to ask, it is plain that the contrary, doubting, against which he cautions us, must be, as Mr. Marshall observes, a doubting whether we shall obtain the things that we ask. This is all that Mr. Marshall's argument requires; and there is nothing against it in Mr. Bellamy's observations.

On Mark xi. 24, Mr. Bellamy puts the following gloss:—"Whosoever the disciples of Christ were called to perform any miraculous works, and were looking up to God to do them, they must firmly believe that he would do the thing." This observation is nothing against, but rather serves to strengthen Mr. Marshall's argument: for though the faith of miracles differed from saving faith, in respect of its aim or end; that of the one being the accomplishment of an external miraculous work, that of the other being the salvation of the soul; yet they agreed in two respects; for both proceeded upon a word of promise; and both were means of obtaining the thing promised. Hence, as Mr. Marshall justly observes, "the faith of miracles gives us some light as to the nature of saving faith. Christ assured them on whom they were wrought, and who had the commission for working them, that the miracles should be wrought if they believed, without doubting of the event. There is a reason for this resemblance; because, the end of working miracles was to confirm the doctrine of the gospel of salvation, by faith in Christ's name,

as the Scriptures clearly show: and, indeed, the salvation of a sinner is, itself, a very great miracle." But, the truth is, Mr. Bellamy had no sufficient reason to limit the faith spoken of in v. 24th to the faith of miracles. Our Lord, indeed, speaks of the faith of miracles in the foregoing verse; but, in this verse, he goes on to speak of that faith which is common to all his people. It is usual with our Lord to take occasion, from things of a more peculiar nature, to discourse of the common duty of Christians. Thus, for example, from the case of one doing a miracle in his name, he takes occasion to speak of the ordinary duty of doing offices of kindness to Christians, for his sake. Mark ix. 39, 40, 41. That, in this 24th verse, he speaks of that believing which is common to all true Christians, appears from the expression, *when ye pray*. Wherever praying is mentioned absolutely, as here, it is to be understood of the common duty of prayer. This is still more evident from the following verse, which shows that the prayer here meant, is that in which we are to exercise the duty of forgiving others their trespasses against us. Now, if the praying in which this faith is exercised, be the common duty of Christians, then the faith itself is so too. It is plainly the import of our Lord's words, that the former ought never to be without the latter. This place of Scripture, says Mr. Calvin, serves excellently to set "forth the nature and efficacy of faith, showing that it is an assured resting upon the goodness of God, which admits not of doubting. They only believe in Christ's account, who view God as propitious, or reconciled to them; and who doubt not but that he will give them what they ask. Hence we see what a diabolical delusion, or fascination, the Papists are under, who contend for a doubting faith, and charge us with presumption if we dare come into his presence in the persuasion of his paternal favour towards us. Paul represents it as a principal benefit which we have by Christ, that in him we have boldness and access, with confidence, by the faith of him."

Before we conclude this letter, it may be proper to take notice of Mr. Bellamy's remarks on some passages of the xvi. Dialogue of Mr. Hervey's Theron and Aspasio.

Mr. Hervey observes, that "this appropriating persuasion is comprehended in all the figurative descriptions of faith which occur in Holy Writ. Faith is styled a looking unto Jesus. But if we do not look unto Jesus as the propitiation for our sins, what

comfort, or what benefit can we derive from the sight? When the Israelites looked unto the brazen serpent, they certainly regarded it as a remedy, each particular person for himself. Faith is styled a resting upon Christ, or a receiving of him. But when I rest upon an object, I use it as my support. When I receive a gift, I take it as my own property. Faith is a casting ourselves upon Christ. This may receive some elucidation, from an incident recorded in the Acts. When those who sailed with Paul, saw their vessel threatened; saw the waves prevailing; saw no hope of safety from continuing in the ship, they cast themselves upon the floating planks. They cast themselves upon the planks without any scruple; not questioning their right to make use of them; and they claved to these supporters with a cheerful confidence; not doubting but, according to the apostle's promise, they should escape safe to land. So we are to cast ourselves upon the Lord Jesus, without indulging a doubt concerning our right to make use of him, or the impossibility of his failing us. Faith is characterized by eating the bread of life. And can this be done without a personal application? Faith is expressed by putting on Christ, as a commodious and beautiful garment. And can any idea, or any expression, more strongly denote an actual appropriation?

The unprejudiced will allow these observations to be much to Mr. Hervey's purpose; that is, they clearly prove that there is, in the nature of saving faith, an application of Christ to ourselves in particular.

And what does Mr. Bellamy reply? Why, says he, "Christ is to be acknowledged, received, and honoured, according to his character, as the promised Messiah. Is he compared to the brazen serpent? We are not to believe that we are healed; but to look to him for healing. Is he compared to a city of refuge? We are not to believe ourselves safe; but to fly to him for safety. Is he compared to bread and water? We are not to believe that our hunger and thirst are assuaged; but to eat the living bread, and to drink the living water, that they may be so."

In this reply we observe, first, that Mr. Bellamy misrepresents the sentiments of his opponents. For they are so far from saying that faith is a belief, that we are healed, or that we are already in a safe state, or that our hunger and thirst are assuaged; that they will not allow that faith, properly speaking, believes any thing concerning the state

we are already in, excepting that we are miserable sinners, of Adams family, to whom the gospel is preached. And while they tell sinners that the gospel is directed to them, in such a manner as to warrant their immediate reception of Christ, as therein exhibited; they at the same time declare that the gospel, without that reception of Christ, will be unprofitable to them. In the next place, it is to be observed, that, in Mr. Bellamy's remark, there is no notice taken of Mr. Hervey's argument; the force of which lies in two things. One is, that it is only true and saving faith, which is meant by these metaphorical expressions. The other thing is, that each of them includes the notion of a person's application of something to his own use, or for the benefit of himself, in particular. If these two things hold true, (and Mr. Bellamy says nothing against either of them,) it will necessarily follow, that there is such an application of Christ to ourselves, in the nature of saving faith.

Another argument which Mr. Hervey offers in support of this doctrine, is, that our Saviour calls the act of Thomas, which he expressed by saying, *my Lord and my God*, believing. John xx. 28, 29. To this Mr. Bellamy answers in the following words—"The thing that Thomas was so faithless about, was not his particular interest in Christ; nor was this the thing he believed, that Christ died for him in particular. But the resurrection of Christ was the thing, the only thing in question with him. Overjoyed to see him, feel him, hear him, know him; in the language of fervent love, he cries out, *my Lord and my God*. Thus then stands the argument—because Thomas believed that Christ was risen from the dead on the clearest evidence, therefore justifying faith consists in believing that pardon is mine, grace is mine, Christ and all his spiritual blessings are mine, without any evidence at all from Scripture, sense, or reason."

Here it is necessary to observe, as before, that the force of Mr. Hervey's argument lies in two things. The first is, that what Thomas expressed on this occasion, was true and saving faith. That it was so, is evident from our Lord's declaration of the blessedness of those who should believe, as Thomas had done, without having the opportunity, which he had, of seeing Christ with the bodily eye. The other thing on which Mr. Hervey's argument stands, is, that what our Lord calls Thomas's faith, or believing, included the appropriating persuasion, that Jesus Christ was his own Lord

and God. This, indeed, Mr. Bellamy seems to deny; because, says he, "the resurrection of Christ was the thing, the only thing in question with him;" and, therefore, the only thing that our Lord represented Thomas as believing on this occasion. But when Mr. Bellamy supposes that Thomas might have doubted of Christ's resurrection, without doubting of his being his Lord and his God, he supposes a gross absurdity; namely, that Christ might have been Thomas's Lord and God, though he had continued in the state of the dead. Surely, as the apostle declares, (1 Cor. xv. 17,) "If Christ be not raised, *our faith is vain, we are yet in our sins.*" Besides, the believing which our Lord here ascribes to Thomas, cannot be limited to the historical fact, that Christ rose from the dead; because our Lord pronounces them all blessed, who attain such believing. But they are not all blessed who believe that historical fact. For wicked men may believe it, and devils believe it, and tremble. After all, can any thing be plainer than this, that our Lord, when he says to Thomas, *thou hast believed*, refers to the declaration which Thomas had made immediately before, of his faith, in these words, *my Lord and my God*; or that the faith declared in these words is an appropriating faith? We may add a judicious observation of Dr. Guise on this passage: "Though the seeing and the handling of the risen body of our Lord," says this expositor, "were strong inducements or motives to this divine appropriating faith; yet it was the word of Christ set home upon his heart, with power, which begat it in him; for, it was immediately upon Christ's saying, *Be not faithless, but believing*, that he cried out, *my Lord and my God.*"

We conclude this letter with a caution, which may be of use to remove a common prejudice against our doctrine, concerning the nature of saving faith. When we say, that a real persuasion that Christ is mine, and that I shall have eternal salvation through his name, belongs to the essence of faith, it is not meant that a person never acts faith but when he is sensible of such a persuasion. There are various degrees of faith; and its language is sometimes more, sometimes less distinct and explicit. The confidence of faith is, in many, like a grain of mustard seed; or like a spark of heavenly fire amidst the troubled sea of all manner of corruptions and temptations; which, were not this faith secretly supported by the power of God, according to his promise, would soon extinguish it. Hence this real persua-

sion may be rooted in many a heart, in which, for a time, it cannot be distinctly discerned, yet in some measure discovers itself, by secret wrestling against unbelief, slavish fear, and all other corruptions. —*Anderson's Letters—Letter 2.*

AN ESSAY

Towards bringing about a Scriptural Unanimity amongst all the different branches of the visible Church of Christ.

(Continued from page 469.)

III. THE third thing proposed in this essay was to notice some of the obstacles, which seem at present to be preventing this unanimity, in the visible church.

1. The first which I will notice, is a low estimate of divine truths. It must now be evident, that the unanimity required of the visible church can never be attained to, until all her branches and all her members, are brought to walk by the same rule, and to mind the same things; and this must be the rule and the things prescribed in the word of God. But persons will never study to attain to a correct, or a particular understanding of this rule, and these things, until they are persuaded that they are of divine importance. There is a specious, though a very false maxim of extensive influence in the church at present, the whole tendency of which must be to depreciate the value and importance of divine truths. The maxim is this—*That the particular truths of God's word are not of very much importance.* If you specify any particular truth, of divine revelation, it may be admitted to be a truth, but then it is but one truth, and it may be reckoned a small one, and therefore, even by many professors in these times, it is reckoned illiberal to contend for these small and solitary truths. They are set down as the mint, the anise, the cummin of gospel truth. But then it should be remembered that the operation of this maxim has a tendency to destroy the scriptures as a rule altogether. If I am at liberty to reject from the rule of my faith or my practice, this or that article that I may judge to be small, my neighbor certainly possesses the same prerogative. What I judge small and reject, he may judge of sufficient importance to be retained among the articles of his faith. And on the other hand, what he may judge small and lay aside as unimportant, I may deem worthy of a place in my creed. Thus the question between us would be, not what is taught? or, what is not? Not, what has God revealed? But what is important?

And where is the infallible standard to which we could appeal to determine this question? Not the word of God; for the dispute is not whether the article is there or not, but whether it is important or not. This then can only be a matter of opinion. And hence it would be our own opinion of the importance of what God has revealed, and not that which he has revealed, that we would be taking for our rule. And this is all the Deist would ask. He is ready to receive the scriptures as far as they accord with his own opinion. But another objection to this maxim is, that it charges the want of *wisdom* on the author of divine revelation. For according to it, he has revealed and recorded what was not necessary to be known.

2. Another thing which prevents unanimity in the visible church, is a decline of a spirit of investigation after truth. People, even professors, are willing to ask, with Pilate, "What is truth?" And it is apt to be too much in the spirit of Pilate, "What is truth," that so much need be said about it! What is it, in comparison of union? What is it, that it should stand in the way of church fellowship? That it should be a barrier in the way of Presbyterians, Congregationalists, Episcopalians, Methodists, Baptists, Papists, &c., all sitting down at the same communion table? This, if we take practice for a comment on profession, seems to be the amount and the spirit of the inquiries after truth in the present times.—There is now no daily searching of the scriptures, to see whether these things be so, which are heard from the pulpit. Does the preacher avoid doctrinal discussions and controverted points, say nothing but what will please every body, and warmly address himself to the feelings of his hearers? It is enough. He is at once set down for a great preacher. And nobody cares what doctrines he may teach, or whether he teaches any at all, provided he pleases them, while he is preaching. The direct tendency of such a spirit is to place it in the power of every popular speaker, to create a division in the church. However generally the scriptures be acknowledged as the rule of both faith and practice, but few take the trouble to compare the doctrines which they either hear or read, with that unerring standard. And whatever may have been the causes to which the present divisions of the church, should be traced, it must be evident, that this indifference to truth, is a principal cause in keeping them up. And until this obstacle be removed, we may look in vain for that happy period, when all the members of the

visible church, "shall think the same things and speak the same things," and when they shall, "with one mind and one mouth praise the Lord:" And when "assembled kingdoms" shall unite in this glorious exercise. Yet such a period is in prospect to the church. He who is able to bring it to pass, and who cannot lie, has promised it. But yet, if we believe his word, it cannot come until these obstacles be removed. 'That which letteth [hindreth], will let, until it be taken out of the way.' When the truth could only be professed at the expense of every earthly enjoyment, even of life itself, men were more diligent in their researches after it. Though the number of professors might not be so great, yet their unanimity, their intelligence would be incalculably greater. Every article of their faith would then be brought to the standard of God's word. But unhappily for union in the church, a set of false but specious maxims, have, to a very great extent in the visible church, usurped the place of the word of God. One of these was considered under the last particular. Another, and the one which chiefly supplanted that spirit of investigation, that once distinguished the followers of Jesus, falls properly under notice here. It is this, 'provided men be sincere, it is not very important, what they know or believe or profess.' That this maxim, which indeed, is nothing else, but that old papistical adage, 'That ignorance is the mother of devotion,' [they mean true devotion] in a modern dress; I say that this maxim, has not only an extensive influence at present in the church; but, that it is openly avowed and defended by many, the writer can attest, from his own observation. Its practical operation with that of other maxims of the same class, is well set forth, by a correspondent in Vol. IV. of the Religious Monitor, at page 100. And although the remarks there, are rather more extensive than had been contemplated, by the writer of this Essay, on this part of his subject, yet they are so judicious, and so seasonable that he is induced to adopt them in this part of his subject. "It is a fact," says that writer, "which will not be disputed, that the sentiment contained in this maxim is entertained and avowed by many in the church, and something very nearly akin to it, is frequently emitted both from the pulpit and the press. And there is reason to believe, that it is often acted upon when it is neither avowed by the lips nor well defined in the mind. Under its influence, many a thoughtless sinner is bolstered up in ignorance and error, and goes down to the grave

with a lie in his right hand. Under its operation, men either make no profession at all, or make such a profession as caprice or convenience dictates, without enquiring whether they are espousing the cause of God or not. Under its influence, men live at ease in their consciences, ignorant of their own creed and that of others; and thus there is danger of the truth perishing from the earth. Such at least would be the danger, were it not for the faithfulness of the church's Head, pledged for its preservation. I may add, that the spurious charity and liberality of the present day, either originate in this manner, or are fostered and cherished by it. Let us, then endeavour to ascertain its true character. 1st. It involves a very absurd supposition, viz: that man may be truly sincere, and yet indifferent to the truth of God. It is granted that the heart may be sincere when there is much darkness, much unbelief, much error remaining. But this cannot be the case, when the darkness is loved, where the unbelief is cherished, where error is fondly embraced. Strange sincerity indeed! What! a sincere believer, who takes no pains to know the truth! A sincere lover of Christ, who regards not his authority! A sincere servant of God, who loves not, and who examines not his word! A sincere witness for Christ, who cares not whether he testify truth or falsehood! Away with such inconsistencies. They carry their own confutation along with them. There may be sincerity, where there are many weaknesses and defects; but if the heart is indeed sincere, there will be a desire producing an effort to know the true ways of the Lord. 2d. The maxim in question not only involves absurdity, but infidelity. It is an infidel sentiment, because it goes to emancipate men from the authority of God, and to place their faith under no other rule than that of their own wandering imaginations, or erring consciences. Protestants have always said that "God alone is Lord of the conscience;" but this sentiment dethrones God, and says, that conscience has no Lord. Again, it is an infidel sentiment, because it would render the Bible entirely useless as a rule of faith; for if one sentiment, or system of belief, be as good and as safe as another; where is the use of any Revelation on the subject? It is manifest that there is none. Such a sentiment therefore in the mouth of the infidel would be quite appropriate; but in the mouth of a professed Christian, it is sadly out of place. 3d. This maxim will sanction the greatest absurdities that have ever been believed, and the most atrocious

abominations, that have ever been perpetrated. Saul of Tarsus "verily thought that he ought to do many things contrary to the name of Jesus of Nazareth." Saul then was sincere. And this maxim would say, that he was perfectly right in persecuting Christians to the death. The Saviour forewarns his disciples, that the time was coming when whosoever should kill them, would think he was doing God service. Upon the principle of this maxim these persecutors were perfectly right. And God accepted the blood of his saints, shed by them, as a pleasing sacrifice. The superstitious Catholic, in the worship of images—the follower of Mahomet, in his furious zeal for the cause of the false prophet—the Hindoo devotee, in his self immolation under the *car* of Juggernaut—all may be sincere. Of this there can be no doubt, when we consider the practical efforts, and sacrifices by which their sincerity is attested. And are we then to conclude, that all these are just as acceptable worshippers of God, as the man who is taught by his spirit through his word, and who worships and serves God in Christ, in knowledge, sincerity and truth?" If these views be correct, sincerity is no test of truth. And *that unanimity* which has any thing else than the truth of Gods word, for its object, can have no tendency to produce or maintain union among the friends of our Redeemer; which is the great object to be obtained. So long as the professors of religion are disposed to consider every sentiment or doctrine, however contradictory to one another, equally acceptable in the sight of God, and equally instrumental in the sanctification of believers, they will give themselves but little concern about unanimity.—And were this the case, it would indeed be a matter of small moment. But this is a sentiment contrary to the whole tenor of scripture. The very fact that God has made a revelation which teaches us, what we are to believe concerning God, proves that it cannot be a matter of indifference. Consequently, neither sincerity nor any other consideration except conformity to God's written word, can be safely adopted as a test of orthodoxy, or what is acceptable to the God of truth. And until the whole inquiry respecting either faith or practice, turns on this one question—"Is it taught in the word of God?" we may continue to look for divisions and schisms in the visible church. But I must proceed to notice other existing causes.

3. Another cause which has its full share of influence at present, in causing and keep-

ing up divisions, is, a spirit of innovation in religious matters. It is true that the enquirer after divine truth may be continually progressing in knowledge, he may be attaining to clearer discoveries of duty, but it will be only in proportion as his acquaintance with the revealed will of God, is extended. Because this is the only instrument which the holy spirit makes use of in communicating saving knowledge. But then the principal means of attaining to all necessary knowledge on religious subjects, is just the same now, to those who have the word of God in their hands and can read, that it has ever been. For with our greatest exertions after knowledge on divine subjects, we never can rise above what is written in the volume of inspiration. What of God's will has been revealed and recorded in the scriptures, has been written for our learning, and belongs to us. But all that is above this, belongs to God. The scriptures are, then, the utmost limits to which the human mind can reach, in its pursuit after divine knowledge. These have been long completed. See Rev. xxii. 18, 19. Hence there is no place left for *inventions* in religious matters. Not only all necessary, but all admissible ordinances must be found in the word. And that religious system is the most perfect, which has approached the nearest in conformity to the rule of the word. The command of Jehovah, is "stand ye in the ways and see, and ask for the old paths, where is the good way, and walk therein." To which he annexes this promise, "and ye shall find rest to your souls." Jer. vi. 16. But many in the present age seem to think that there is the same room for discovery and invention in religious matters, that there is in mechanical philosophy or physical science, where every thing depends on actual experiment. Does any new doctrine, institution, scheme or plan, appear to short-sighted human reason, better calculated to make men religious, than what is to be found in the "old paths" of divine revelation? the new is immediately adopted. And that too, by thousands in the church who never once suspect that they are giving human invention, the preference of divine institution. This is a spirit which has long been disturbing the peace of God's church. When Ahaz, one of the kings of Judah, on a certain occasion went over to Damascus to meet the king of Assyria, he saw at Damascus, an altar, the fashion of which pleased him. He preferred it so much to the altar in the temple at Jerusalem, that he took the pattern of it, which he sent to Urijah the Priest, with instruc-

tions to have one made like it by the time he returned to Jerusalem. 2 Kings xvi. 10—18. Now the altar in Jerusalem had been made according to a pattern and directions given immediately by God the Supreme Architect of the Universe, and by men highly gifted by God, with a spirit of ingenuity and skill for this special purpose. But the one at Damascus was invented and built by a heathen man, whom indeed God made, but on whom he bestowed no special qualifications for that purpose. Now if there was a pious worshipper at Jerusalem, who revered the institutions of God's own appointment, he must have perceived with deep concern the preparations for a new altar making by Urijah.

Such a person must have felt himself, excluded from the Temple, when he saw the altar of the Lord at which he and his fathers had worshipped, removed, and this one, made after an idolatrous pattern, placed in its stead; and the morning and the evening sacrifice offered upon it. And so long as that innovation continued that person could not bring his offering to that altar. But many persons plead that the same strictness is not required under the New Testament dispensation that was under the Old. But in reply to this, it should be enquired: Has God changed his will? or is he not the same yesterday, to-day and forever? Has God relinquished his right to prescribe the way and manner in which he is to be worshipped? If he has not, it must now be as sinful to 'worship him in any other way than that which is appointed in his word,' as ever it was. And that he has not, that solemn sanction which he has given to his word as a rule of faith and obedience, already referred to, (Rev. xxii. 18, 19.) plainly shows; "For I testify unto every man that heareth the words of the prophecy of this book, if any man shall add unto these things, God shall add unto him the plagues that are written in this book: And if any man shall take away from the words of the prophecy of this book, God shall take away his part out of the book of life, and out of the holy city, and from the things that are written in this book."

Selections.

LETTERS ON THE INTRODUCTION AND PROGRESS OF UNITARIANISM IN NEW ENGLAND. NO. V.

DEAR SIR,—

It was intimated, you will recollect, in my last, that the manner in which Unitari-

anism gained the ascendancy in Harvard College would be considered in another communication. To this branch of the general subject allow me now to call your attention.

Harvard College, you know, was instituted with special reference to the exigencies of the church, and for the maintenance and promotion of true religion. Accordingly, "the first law in the College code respecting the students, enacted by the Overseers in 1642, was, that 'Every one shall consider it the *main end* of his life and studies, to know God and Jesus Christ, which is eternal life.' " For many years after its establishment, the Institution continued to fulfill the object and the wishes of its pious founders. During the first half century, nearly all the ministers who were settled in New-England received their education at Harvard College. And until within the last thirty or forty years, by far the greater part of the clergy of Massachusetts were graduates of the same institution. The College, at different periods of our history, partook deeply of the religious character of the times; or perhaps I might better say, it *gave* a character to the times. Those who were first educated, in the days of the original settlers, and under the enlightened and fervent ministry of Mr. Shepherd, were in general pious and devoted men.* A season of declension afterwards followed, in the College, as well as throughout the country. It should be said, however, of Dr. Increase Mather, the sixth President of the College, and perhaps the most distinguished of all its Presidents, that he strenuously opposed the introduction of the half-way covenant, and the views of Mr. Stoddard relative to the terms of Christian communion.

When Mr. Whitefield visited the College in 1740, he found it in what he considered a state of lamentable declension. "Tutors," says he, "neglected to pray with and examine the hearts of their pupils. Discipline was at a low ebb. Bad books had become fashionable amongst the students." The forms of religion were maintained, but its power was not felt. It should be added, that Cambridge profited less from the revival under Whitefield, than most other places in the vicinity of Boston. Still, however, there was no avowed and

open defection from the faith of the New England churches, till many years subsequent to the time of Whitefield.

Dr. Langdon, who was elected President in 1774, and resigned in 1780, was a decided Calvinist, as appears from his "Summary of Christian Faith and Practice," published in 1768. The younger Wigglesworth was at this time Professor of Divinity, who, though less explicit on some points than his father, was certainly a Trinitarian and a Calvinist. Dr. Willard* succeeded to Dr. Langdon; was inaugurated Dec. 19, 1781; and continued in the Presidency till his death in 1804. He was a literary man, and was thought by many to be an Arminian. He did not insist on some theological points so fully as most of his predecessors; still, if he used words and phrases in their customary acceptation, he is to be regarded as a man of Evangelical principles. In his farewell sermon to his people at Beverly, he exhorts them to choose a successor, "who will preach Jesus Christ, and him crucified, as the *great foundation of their hopes*." In his sermon at the ordination of Mr. M'Keen, his successor at Beverly,† he speaks of Christ as having "*assumed our nature*," and "offered himself a *sacrifice and atonement for a guilty world*." He calls the church "the flock of Christ, which *he hath purchased with his own blood*," and directs his hearers to pray for "*pardon-ing mercy through the merits of our blessed Redeemer*." In his sermon at the funeral of Rev. Mr. Hilliard, of Cambridge, he says, The good minister "will direct the views of his hearers to Jesus Christ, whom God hath set forth to be a *propitiation for the sins of a guilty world, that he might be the great foundation of men's hopes*." President Willard knew very well the sense in which this phraseology was customarily used, and all who do not wish to charge him with intentional deception will agree with me in the belief, that, though less explicit on some points than might be desirable, he was, on the whole, a man of moderate Evangelical principles—very different, certainly, from the Unitarians of the present day.

The late Dr. Tappan was constituted Professor of Divinity at Cambridge in 1792, and continued in the office till his death, in 1803. He was an amiable and excellent man, whose name is still revered, and whose memory is precious. His influence was

* It was from a regard, says Mather, to "the enlightened and powerful ministry of Mr. Shepherd, that, when the foundation of a College was to be laid, Cambridge, rather than any other place was pitched upon to be the seat of that happy seminary." Book iii. p. 87.

* Great grandson of the first President Willard, who published Lectures on the Assembly's Catechism

† Afterwards President of Bowdoin College.

great, while connected with the College, in arresting the progress of infidelity, and corruption, which then threatened to overspread the land. His religious principles were decidedly of the Orthodox or Evangelical stamp. "It is well known," says his biographer, "that his views of some of the most important subjects, such as Christ's character and atonement, God's eternal scheme and all-directing providence, depravity and regeneration, the distinguishing nature of religion, and future retribution, were conformed to the views which the founders of the College and the fathers of New England entertained. They were such as were exhibited in the renowned Assembly's Catechism, which, for the sake of distinction, has been generally called the Orthodox, or Calvinistic scheme." This representation of the religious sentiments of Dr. Tappan is abundantly confirmed, by quotations from his published works. See Panoplist vol. i. pp. 185—192.

Of the religious character of President Webber, who succeeded President Willard in 1806,* I am not particularly informed. He was chiefly distinguished as a mathematician, and probably exerted but little direct influence in forming the religious character of the College. Professor Ware, in the eulogy pronounced on occasion of his death, in 1810, speaking of his religious character, says, "His views of doctrines were *liberal and enlightened*." I infer from this, that Dr. Ware considered him a Unitarian; and probably he was one. At any rate, he exerted no influence to check the progress of Unitarianism, which was insiduously spreading all around him, during the period of his administration.

After the death of Dr. Tappan, the Professorship of Divinity was vacant for more than a year. The Corporation were divided, and for a time equally divided, so that nothing could be done. At length, a change was known to have taken place, so that a majority could be obtained for the present incumbent;† and in Nov. 1804, the Corporation were called on in the public papers to act, and not to wait for greater unanimity. A warm newspaper discussion now commenced, and was continued, chiefly on

one side of the question, till after the election was made and confirmed. In opposition to the election of Dr. Ware, it was urged that he was understood to be a *Unitarian*. But his friends replied, that he had never professed the sentiment imputed to him, and that to mention such a thing was "a *calumny*." Indeed, the pretence that his religious principles were unsound, was ridiculed as one not entitled to serious consideration. "it is well known," it was said, "that an alarm has been raised: 'Beware, he is an Arminian! he is an Arian!'"

"Fenum habet in cornu—longe fuge."

One of the principal writers in favor of Dr. Ware professed to be "solicitous to establish the opinions of our forefathers about *essential doctrines*," but urged the liberality of the Hollises as a reason for not being strenuous, and cautioned his opposers against imputing to him "unpopular or erroneous sentiments." It was urged by some, that the creed of the proposed Professor was of no consequence; that he need not inculcate, or so much as avow, his particular sentiments; that his business was to open and explain Divine subjects, and leave his pupils to form their own opinions.*

In this controversy, the press was quite at the service of the friends of Dr. Ware, and it was with great difficulty that those of a different opinion could procure the insertion of their communications. One writer in particular, calling himself Calvinus, sent an article to the office of the Centinel, where it was detained for some considerable time, then promised an insertion, and then refused. It was afterwards published in the Palladium, though attempts were made to dissuade the conductors of that paper from inserting it. (See Palladium for Dec. 18, 1804.)

The grand objection to the election of Dr. Ware, or rather to the confirmation of his election by the Board of Overseers, was, that the Board had no evidence of his possessing the qualifications required by the founder of the Professorship. Mr. Hollis, the founder, had required *expressly* "that the man chosen, from time to time, to be a Professor," on his foundation, should be "of sound or *ORTHODOX principles*;" and the Corporation of the College had solemnly pledged themselves and their successors, by a written bond, that the orders of Mr. Hollis, in respect to this, should be fulfilled. But the Overseers had no evidence that Dr.

* The Hon. Fisher Ames was appointed to succeed President Willard, but declined.

† Two of the Corporation died in 1804, viz. Dr. Howard and President Willard; and in place of Dr. Howard, Dr. Elliot of Boston was elected. After his election, the Corporation consisted of Hon. Oliver Wendall, Hon. John Davis, Rev. Doctors Lathrop, Elliot and Pierson, and Ebenezer Storer, Esq., Treasurer.

* See Columbia Centinel, from Nov. 1804, to March 1805; also the Anthology for Feb. 1805.

Ware was a man "of sound or Orthodox principles," according to the intent of Mr. Hollis; nor could they obtain any satisfaction on this point. "The right to examine him was denied" them. His "particular religious principles, though often asked for, were not disclosed." "It was particularly asked, whether he was a believer in that important doctrine, the *Divinity of the Lord Jesus Christ*;" but "the reply conveyed no precise or satisfactory answer on that point.* Indeed, so far were the opposers of Dr. Ware's election from being convinced that he was "of sound or Orthodox principles," according to the intent of Mr. Hollis, they had the utmost reason to believe, from his silence, and from a variety of collateral evidence, that this was not the case. It was insisted, therefore, that whatever they might think of him as a man, and whatever judgment they might, as individuals, form in regard to his principles, they were bound by the orders of Mr. Hollis, and by the solemn pledges which had been given him, and could not vote to confirm the election.

Those who opposed the election of Dr. Ware, were at that time the subjects of much severe reproach. They were attacked in some of the publications of the day, without decency or mercy; and the most of them have gone down, unforgotten, to the grave. But posterity, certainly, will do them justice. Future generations will appreciate their motives, and honour their correctness of principle, their decision and firmness.

For, in the first place, whatever meaning we attach to the requisition of Hollis, Dr. Ware had no right to the Professorship, until he had been examined, and ascertained to be in the belief of the principles prescribed. If by "sound and Orthodox," Hollis meant Unitarian, Dr. Ware was not certainly known to be a Unitarian, and his friends denied that this was his sentiment. Or if, by "sound and Orthodox," Hollis meant Universalist, Dr. Ware was not certainly known to be a Universalist. "The right to examine him was denied." His "particular religious principles, though often asked for, were not disclosed." Consequently, whatever meaning the Overseers might attach to the words of Hollis, they could not know that the candidate was of the prescribed belief, and therefore could not with propriety vote to confirm his election.

But, secondly, those who opposed the elec-

tion of Dr. Ware had no doubt, and could have none, as to what meaning they were bound to put upon the words of Hollis. These words, they knew, had a *definite* theological meaning in the time of Hollis, as they now have, and this meaning they felt themselves bound, as honest men, to regard. Or if they receded from this ground, and consented to interpret the words of Hollis by his own principles, they were brought to the same result: For Hollis, they knew, was Orthodox in the *technical sense*; i. e. he was a decided *Trinitarian and Calvinist*. They had heard him (by his letters) express his full approbation of the works of Calvin. "I imagine they will please you (Dr. Coleman) AS THEY DO ME." They had heard him lament his "corrupt nature," and ascribe his salvation to the "rich, free and *sovereign electing love*" of God. They had heard him say, "My rejoicing is in Jesus Christ, *my God and Saviour*. My hope is to be accepted in the beloved, and to be acquitted and justified before God the Father, *only on account of the obedience, active and passive, of the Lamb of God who taketh away the sin of the world*. He is the *propitiation* for our sins, and through faith in him I hope for peace with God, the continued influences of his Spirit, and complete redemption. Glory be to God in the highest, while we *adore the economy of the DIVINE THREE* in the revealed works of our salvation. Amen."* And lest it should be said (as it has been) that he afterwards changed his principles; in a poem pronounced on occasion of his death, they had heard his zeal for the Calvinistic doctrine very highly extolled.

"Rather proclaim for ancient truths his zeal;
For truths there were Hollis would boldly own,
Loose as the age, and desperate, is grown.
Such did *imputed righteousness* appear,
Title to heaven, and ground of pardon here;
Such, Christ, the honours of thy rev'rend name;
Such, glorious Spirit, thy celestial flame;
Such the grand mystery of the *ETERNAL THREE*,
Persons if meant—but ONE, if Deity.
On these, he *frankly did his thoughts disclose*;
For these, his *int'rest frequent interpose*."†

To these lines, the following note was appended by the Poet:—"I have been informed that Mr. Hollis entertained a very honourable esteem for the doctrines of the *ever blessed Trinity*, the *imputed righteousness of Christ*, &c., and that his openly avowing these principles was a check up-

* Morse's True Reasons, p. 8.

† Extract from a poem on the death of Thomas Hollis, Esq., by Sayer Rudd, London, 1731. p. 23.

* See Morse's True Reasons, &c. p. 19.

on some, who appeared to have no great opinion of them."

A respected member of the Board of Overseers requested leave to present, for the consideration of the Board, the evidence that Hollis was a Calvinist; but *he was refused*—a majority fearing probably (for I can account for their refusal in no other way) that the light might derange their intended proceedings, and therefore choosing to move in the dark.

Knowing therefore, as the opposers of the election of Dr. Ware certainly did, the religious principles of Mr. Hollis, they could not doubt as to the sense in which he used the words "sound or Orthodox." He used them, beyond all dispute, in the proper sense—the technical sense—the sense in which he was himself Orthodox—the sense in which every person of similar sentiments, whether in old England or New, would have used them, who expected or wished to be understood. Besides, Mr. Hollis left a practical comment on the phraseology of his orders, in the first Professor Wigglesworth, who was examined and chosen under his inspection, and with his entire and avowed approbation.

With all this evidence before them as to the meaning of Mr. Hollis's orders—with the solemn promise staring them in the face that these orders should be fulfilled—without any evidence, or the means of obtaining any, that Dr. Ware was such an one as these orders required—but in the possession of abundant evidence that this was not the case; how could those who opposed his election have done differently from what they did? Manifestly they acted from principle, and they acted right; and the time has already come, when their once injured names, are revered and honoured for the stand which they then took, and the firmness which they exhibited.

Of Dr. Ware himself. I have no disposition to speak reproachfully. His situation is, of all men's, least to be envied. He is approaching that period when the countenance and the caresses of interested and partial friends will avail him nothing. He may possess many estimable social qualities, and I doubt not he does; but on the question of his accepting and holding the Hollis Professorship of Divinity in Harvard College, the impartial of all denominations have formed their judgment, and it will not be reversed. He knew the conditions of this Professorship; he knew the solemn pledges which had been given in respect to it; he knew also his own religious sentiments,

though he took care that others should not know them; yet, he accepted the appointment, promised that he would "religiously observe the statutes of his founder," and for almost twenty-five years has been receiving his bread from a Professorship, which was founded by a strictly Orthodox man, and was consecrated and pledged for the support of such a man, in all future time.

Nor is even this, perhaps, the worst of the case. In 1747, Daniel Henchman, Esq. of Boston left a legacy to aid in the support of the Hollis Professor of Divinity in Harvard College—on the *express* condition that "the person in that office," "shall *profess* and *teach* the principles of the Christian religion, according to the *well known Confession of Faith drawn up by the synod of the churches in New England.*" This legacy was accepted, on the annexed condition, and added to the endowment of Mr. Hollis. But the present Hollis Professor neither professes nor teaches the principles of the Christian religion, according to the New England Confession of Faith. He professes and teaches entirely different principles. Yet the Henchman legacy is retained, and during his whole term of office, Dr. Ware has consented to receive the avails of it.

For this perversion, I know not that an excuse has ever been attempted. To justify their approbation of Mr. Hollis's donations, Unitarians have alleged, that in requiring his Professor to be "of sound or Orthodox principles," Mr. Hollis did not bind him to embrace the sentiments which he himself approved—or to embrace any particular system of doctrine; but merely to be Orthodox in his own opinion—to prefer his own principles—to be fully persuaded in his own mind. But this obviously is mere trifling—wicked trifling. It is to impute to Mr. Hollis the folly (after consulting, as he tells us he did, with "some of the most learned divines who had been educated at the first Universities in Europe")—the folly of affecting to say something, when in reality he said nothing. For who is not, in this strange, unheard-of sense of the term, Orthodox? Who does not prefer his own religious sentiments? Who would not say that he thought his own principles correct; at least if by so saying, he could secure a lucrative and honourable appointment? The Catholic prefers his own opinions; and so does the Universalist; and so does the Mahometan; and so does the Infidel; and so does every body else; and hence, according to the interpretation here given, no person

is disqualified, or ever can be, in point of religious sentiment, to be the Hollis Professor of Divinity in Harvard College. But really such a perversion of language is too gross to be seriously refuted or examined.—The resort to it only shows the straits to which persons are sometimes driven, and in which they force their consciences to acquiesce, in order to secure a favorite object.*

I have dwelt at length on the circumstances of Dr. Ware's appointment, as this was in fact the triumph of Unitarianism in Harvard College. Unitarian books had been previously circulated, and the minds of many had been deeply poisoned. But now the evil assumed character and prominence, and took possession of a seat from which, of all others, it could be propagated with the greatest facility. During the Presidency of Dr. Webber, the religious concerns of the College were almost entirely under the direction of Dr. Ware; and the opportunity was improved to create and extend an influence in favor of "the new doctrine." Unitarian sentiments were strongly inculcated; Unitarian ministers and lawyers were raised up and sent forth; Unitarian Professors and tutors were appointed; and a system of measures was put in operation to advance the

cause of Unitarianism, make it popular, and give it currency and favour. Still, however, the name was not avowed, and the existence of the thing, at times, was scarcely admitted.

President Webber died suddenly, July 17, 1810; and on the fourteenth of November of the same year, President Kirkland was inaugurated. He commenced his administration by attending a ball on the same evening, "given by the students."—See Anthology for Nov. 1810. Dr. Kirkland had, at this time, made no open profession of Unitarian sentiments; and I have good authority for saying that he owed his elevation to the concealment which he had practised. In a letter from the Rev. Francis Parkman, one of the Unitarian ministers of Boston to a friend in England, dated Feb. 20, 1812, I find the following candid and explicit avowal:

"You say that Dr. Kirkland is a professed Unitarian, and mention him, as if his election to the Presidency of Cambridge University, were a decisive proof of the prevalence of your sentiments among us. Dr. K. was formerly one of the ministers of Boston, and whatever his particular friends may think of his opinions, he never preached these sentiments. Nay, I may venture to say, that had Dr. Kirkland been an *acknowledged defender of Unitarianism*, he would not have been elected to that place. Unitarianism is too unpopular in the country, and his friends, who are at the same time the friends and governors of the University, with all the respect they most justly entertain for his exalted talents and character, and particularly for his candid and liberal mind, would, I believe, have deemed it necessary to sacrifice their private wishes, and consulted the interests of the University in electing a President, whose sentiments were more agreeable to the great body of the Massachusetts clergy, of which, *ex-officio*, he is generally considered the head, and to the sentiments of community at large. Had a decided Unitarian been elected, I really believe that the number of the students would have been diminished."

To this statement of the grounds on which President Kirkland came into office, I need add nothing. His elevation was clearly an imposition on the public; for as Mr. Parkman well observes, "Had Dr. Kirkland been," at that time, "an *acknowledged* defender of Unitarianism, *he would not have been elected to that place.*"

Of the measures taken to promote Unitarianism in College, during the Presidency of Dr. Kirkland, suffice it to say, that *all possible means were used*.—Periodicals were established; books in great numbers and variety were patronised and published; very large sums of money were, in some way, expended; Unitarian officers were appointed; and the work of innovation was carried

* The instance here considered is not the only one in which the funds of Harvard College have been appropriated to objects the most remote from the intentions of the pious donors. In 1637, Hon. Edward Hopkins, previously Governor of Connecticut, died in England, and, among other instances of his great liberality, ordered that "£500 be made over into New-England, for the upholding and promoting the kingdom of the Lord Jesus Christ in those parts of the earth." The sum afterwards fell to the Corporation of Harvard College, and the avails of the fund created by it, to the amount of 700 dollars a year are now appropriated to the support of Unitarian students in the Cambridge Theological School. Gov. Hopkins came to this country in company with Mr. Davenport, in 1637—was a *strict Puritan and Calvinist*—a parishioner and admirer of the excellent Mr. Hooker. He considered Unitarianism as not only different from, but *opposed to*, "the kingdom of the Lord Jesus Christ," and would sooner have sunk his money in the ocean, than have given it for the education of Unitarian ministers.

Further; at the time when Mr. Hollis founded the Professorship of Divinity at Cambridge, he made provision for an annual bounty of £100. to be distributed equally among ten "*pious* young students, devoted to the work of the ministry." No one acquainted with the principles of Hollis can doubt as to the sense in which he must have used the qualifying word "*pious*." He certainly used it in the Calvinistic sense, as denoting those *who believed the doctrines of grace*, and had been *hopefully renewed by the special operations of the Holy Spirit*. It was for the education of such young men that Hollis gave his money; and to apply it, as it is now applied, for the education of Unitarian ministers, is a gross and wicked perversion of it.

on, until the whole concern was revolutionized. The late Dr. McKean, who succeeded Hon. John Quincy Adams as Professor of Rhetoric and Oratory, and received his appointment in 1809, was the last Professor, and I believe the last College officer of any kind, who made pretensions to Orthodoxy. He continued in office till his death, in 1818; though his situation is said to have been rendered unpleasant, at times, on account of his religious sentiments and character.

A Society for Theological Education in Cambridge University was formed in 1816; from which originated, shortly after, the Theological School. This school consists of three classes, each containing, perhaps, on an average, about seven or eight students:—a very small number, it may be thought, but sufficient, I believe, to meet the calls for Unitarian preaching—at least, such calls as the students think it an object to regard.

In introducing and spreading Unitarianism in this region, the community and College have exerted a mutual, reciprocal influence. Both became infected about at the same time, and each has contributed to sustain and assist the other in giving currency to the flattering error. Almost the earliest Unitarians in the country—a full quarter of a century before the name was acknowledged here—became connected with the Corporation of Harvard College. Doctors Lathrop and Howard of Boston were members of the Corporation, from the time of the adoption of the Constitution of Massachusetts, till their death. Judge Lowell became a member in 1784, Gov. Bowdoin (for the second time) in 1793, Judge Davis in 1804, Dr. Elliot in 1806, Judge Parsons in 1807, Hon. John Lowell in 1810. With gentlemen such as these, originated all the College appointments; and, under their influence, appointments would, of course, be made, so as to encourage and advance their particular views.

For the purpose of promoting and perpetuating Unitarianism in Harvard College, repeated alterations have been attempted in the constitution of the Board of Overseers. This Board consisted originally of the Governor, Lieut. Governor, Counsellors and Senators of the Commonwealth, with the ministers of the Congregational churches in Cambridge, Watertown, Charlestown, Boston, Roxbury and Dorchester. But as a body constituted after this manner was liable to continual changes, and Unitarians might not long constitute a majority, an alteration was, in due time, proposed and effected.—“An act passed in 1810, prepared by the

late Chief Justice Parsons, which he declared to a member of the legislature he had held in readiness for more than two years, waiting for a safe opportunity to bring it forward, according to which” the Board was to consist of the President of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and an elective body of fifteen clergymen, and fifteen laymen, with power to fill their own vacancies. By this law, Unitarianism was virtually enthroned at Cambridge, and the way prepared for its perpetual dominion. It was soon found, however, that what the legislature could do, the legislature could undo; as, in 1812, the new order of things was totally abolished, and the government of the College restored to its former standing. Only two years after, the law of 1810, with some alterations, was revived. “According to this last enactment, which is still in force, the Board of Overseers consists of the Governor, Lieut. Governor, the Council, Senate, Speaker of the House Representatives, and an elective body of thirty persons, having power to fill their own vacancies.”

The circumstances under which this act was introduced, were very extraordinary.—The Rev. Dr. Griffin had been for some time pastor of a Congregational church in Boston, and as such, by the express language of the constitution, a member of the Board of Overseers of Harvard College.—No notice, however, was taken of him, nor was he apprised of the time or place of any meetings. At length, he went unasked, and claimed his seat as a member of the Board. His claim was disputed, and the subject referred to a committee, a majority of whom reported in favor of Dr. Griffin. Still, his right was not allowed him; an adjournment was called for to save time; and, in the interval, the law of which we are speaking was whipped through the legislature, obviously for the purpose of excluding Dr. Griffin, and preventing others of similar sentiments from ever more obtaining seats, in the old established way, as Overseers of Harvard College. I am sorry to add, that Hon. Mr. Quincy, now President of Harvard College, was a leading instrument in this crooked business.

The existing act, although less odious, on account of the alterations, than that of 1810, is equally sectarian in its character and tendency, and equally an infringement of constitutional rights. There was an attempt made in the Convention of 1820 to incorporate this act with the Constitution of the State, and thus put it out of the power of any

future legislature to repeal or alter it. But this attempt entirely failed. The article on the subject, prepared and sent out by the Convention, was, by a great majority rejected.*

The effect of the introduction of Unitarianism into Harvard College has been to change, throughout, the character and the intended results of the institution. It was originally devoted to Christ and the church; but instead of affording aid to the *church of Christ*, as this phraseology was understood by its founders, it has been, for several years, a principal engine of opposing and oppressing the church. It was originally intended to furnish to the people of New-England a succession of pious and devoted ministers, and in other ways to sustain the religious interests of the country; but for these many years, not one in ten of the ministers of New-England, and probably not a quarter of the ministers of Massachusetts, have been furnished from this institution, while its influence has been exerted in a variety of ways to subvert and supplant those views of religion, to a regard for which it owes its existence. This College was founded, and has been liberally patronized by the government of Massachusetts, with the intention that it should be the *College of the State*; but by its departure from the principles of the New-England churches, and embracing and inculcating Unitarianism, it has forfeited the confidence of the people at large, ceased to be the College of the State, and became almost entirely the creator of a sect. Its departments are all filled with Unitarians, and Unitarianism is the religion which it labors, every where, and by all methods, to spread and propagate. It is even boasted of, as "*the bulwark of the Unitarian cause*"—"*the pure, uncorrupted fountain head of Unitarianism.*"

Do any ask, in this state of things, *What is to be done?*—Without mentioning all that may be done, one thing to me is very plain. As Harvard College has been seized upon, turned from its original design, and converted into the College of a sect, that sect should now be left to support it. Until Unitarians will so far relax their hold upon it, as to give other denominations a *fair* proportion of influence in its instruction,

* A more full account of these legal changes, of the probable reasons which induced them, and of the circumstances under which they were accomplished, may be found in the Rev. Mr. Cook's "*Reply to a Letter in the Christian Examiner*," (pp. 31—38.) a work to which no answer has ever been attempted, and to which we solicit the attention of our readers.

councils and government, they cannot expect other denominations to unite with them in its support. *Let Evangelical Christians, then, for the present, stand aloof, and give their scholars, their property and their influence to other institutions.* Propriety and consistency of character require this of them. And a regard for the cause of truth and for the immortal interests of those they love best requires the same. Says a student of Harvard College, "I consider myself bound to testify before the world, *that the influence there exerted against sound religious sentiments and vital godliness, is like a SWEEPING FLOOD; to the unfortified minds of youth, it is RESISTLESS.* I am acquainted with no situation where, in my view, (and I speak from sad experience,) a principle of Evangelical piety, and faith in the doctrines of the cross, would be less likely to be obtained, or, if possessed, would be placed in circumstances of greater peril."*

I propose the direction here given in regard to Harvard College, not surely because I am an enemy to the College, but because I am its friend;—because I wish to see it restored to its pristine usefulness and glory. It can never have the confidence or support of the Christian public, and can never permanently prosper, as it now is, and the sooner its governors become convinced of this, the better. Let them consent to abandon their present narrow, sectarian policy; adopt a truly liberal course; divide their authority and influence, in some *fair* proportion, among Christians of other denominations; restore the College to its original destination; and make it what it ought to be, the College of the State; and then they may look with confidence to the State to support it. Then may they solicit, without a blush or a fear, the countenance and patronage of a Christian people.

INVESTIGATOR.

EXILED SWISS PASTORS.

Extract of a letter from one of the exiled Swiss Pastors, dated Grenoble, 1830.

"WELL do I know that this world is not the place of rest. Thanks unto God I do not seek it here; and I can rejoice in being called to labour, though often in a way contrary to the taste of the natural man. The Lord is my portion, my refuge, and my deliverance; and his sweet peace, which amidst the storms of time he richly affords, makes me regard all things as nothing, compared with the excellency of the knowledge of Jesus Christ.

"Notwithstanding persecution, rather should I say by the very help of persecution, the kingdom of Christ continues to make great progress in the

* Church Register, May 31, 1828.

canton of Vaud. That small territory now presents the most gladdening aspect. One may reckon at least fifty ministers who preach the gospel faithfully, and every day their labors in preaching are the means of bringing souls to Christ. The missionary seminary at Lausanne, continues to be supported, and a few pious young men are in the course of education there.

"In France, the kingdom of our Lord has been making happy advances for several years; and the new political revolution which has just taken place will probably facilitate the labours of the genuine servants of God, by disconcerting the dark and impious efforts of the Jesuits.—*Evan. Mag.*

LETTER FROM REV. JONAS KING.

Mr. King, in a letter to the Editor of the *Philadelphian*, dated Tenos, August 28th, says:

With regard to the state of this country, I can only say, that the people are wearied with remaining so long in suspense and doubt, with regard to their political affairs, and that there is much discontent, and murmurs are heard from different quarters. The spirits of many are depressed, and that ardent desire for books and schools, which was manifested a year ago, seems to be in some measure abated, and that from the political circumstances in which they are placed, and perhaps from some other causes.

A new Manual for the schools of mutual instruction is now publishing, (a translation from French,) the first part of which has been sent out by the Government, I believe to all the teachers in Greece, and (as I am told) with an injunction to follow that in the strictest manner. This requires that in every school should be placed in front of the scholars, "the picture of our Saviour, of the transfiguration, or of the *Almighty*." How shocking to us to speak of placing in the schools, or any where else, a picture of the *Almighty*! ***** The school which I have here is not one of mutual instruction, and so I have nothing to do with this subject at present. ***** A change of government may produce a change with regard to schools. Affairs may be better, and they may be worse: and here I leave the subject. The Lord reigns, and I believe he will in some way, cause a reform in this nation. Many things appear favorable; and some quite the reverse. Every thing is liable to change, and especially in this country. One day the heavens are clear and beautiful; the next, overhung with clouds and darkness.

According to the new Manual of mutual instruction, the teacher is to have the Old and New Testaments in his school library; and religious instruction is to be given to his scholars every Tuesday, Thursday and Saturday, one hour each day. The schools are to be opened with prayer, both in the morning and in the afternoon. Scripture history and the gospel are to be taught, and some kind of Catechism. In this I rejoice.

NO RELIGION WITHOUT ITS SPIRIT.

The following fine passage is from a sermon of the late Right Rev. Dr. Middleton, Bishop of Calcutta:—

"Let me caution you against the easy mistake, that you are standing fast in one spirit, if in truth you are sunk into indifference. Men are apt to believe that they agree in religion, and even take credit to themselves for the agreement, when the

subject does not sufficiently interest them to afford any cause of discussion. Unity is indeed precious in the sight of God, and lovely in the eyes of men; but remember that religious unity supposes that we are really religious. In no other case does it deserve the name; and in candour I must admit that better are differences when all men are in earnest, than the mere semblance of Christian agreement when the great and vital doctrines of the gospel are little regarded."

EDUCATION OF THE APPETITES.

It must begin from the earliest infancy, long before the dawn of reason, and even anterior to the evolution of the moral sentiment. The rule on which it is conducted, is a very simple one, applicable to all classes. It is to allow no child the indulgence of an appetite or propensity, other than what is required by its instinctive wants for its bodily support and health. Nothing is to be conceded by the whim or caprice of a parent to the imaginary wants of a child; for it must be constantly borne in mind, that every gratification of any sense, whether of taste, sight, sound, or touch, is the beginning of a desire for its renewal; and that every renewal gives a probability of the indulgence becoming a habit; and that habit once formed, even in childhood, will often remain during the whole of after life, acquiring strength every year, until it sets all laws, both human and divine at defiance. Let parents who allow their children to sip a little of this wine, or to just taste that cordial, or who yield to the cries of their little ones for promiscuous food, or for liberty to sit up a little later, or to torment a domestic animal, or to strike their nurse, or to raise the hand against mama, ponder well on the consequences. If they do not, often vain are the after efforts of instructors; vain the monitions from the pulpit. Their child is in danger of growing up a drunkard, or a glutton, a self-willed sensualist, or passionate and revengeful; prompt to take the life of a fellow being, and to sacrifice his own; and all this because the fond parents were faithless to their trusts. They had not the firmness to do their duty; they feared to mortify their child, and in so doing they exposed him in after life to be mortified by the world's scorn; to wander an unloved, unpitied thing.—*Journal of Health.*

TALLEYRAND ON ROMISH OATHS.

THIS anecdote is taken from the proceedings of the London Missionary Society:

"When the deputation from the London Missionary Society visited France in 1802, to ascertain if Protestant Missionaries would be admitted into France from the English Theological seminaries, they were astonished to find, we believe, nearly all the Prefects of the Departments, Protestants. Having received prompt and full permission for Protestant Missionaries to enter and preach in France, provided they would abstain from all interference in politics, which of course was engaged to be fulfilled—the deputation expressed to Talleyrand their surprise at discovering that all the Chiefs of the public authorities were Protestants. That famous ex-Jesuit and Romish Prelate answered to this effect, that '*the first Consul could not trust any others—for he knew that a Papist could not be bound by his oath any longer than it pleased his confessor—but a Protestant who once swore to be faithful to his Government, would always keep his fidelity.*'"

to af-
ndeed
in the
unity
o oth-
ndour
en all
nce of
d doc-

g be-
to the
le on
appli-
he in-
than
for its
e con-
o the
con-
on of
ad, or
ewal;
of the
once
a dur-
a eve-
d di-
their
taste
ir lit-
to sit
imal,
gainst
they
struc-
Their
or a
e and
w be-
cause
rusts.
they
they
y the
itted

gs of
Mis-
sces-
itted
ina-
eve,
Pro-
per-
and
stain
urse
ex-
ring
were
nish
first
new
path
ut a
his
ty."

Samuel Murphy

TO PATRONS.

It is hoped that the alterations we have made in our plan of publishing the Monitor will be acceptable. Much more reading will be given than heretofore, without any additional expense; and by preserving the numbers and binding two volumes into one, they will make a handsomely proportioned book, and save nearly one-half the expense in binding. Having found some inconvenience heretofore from the want of Greek type, we have procured a fount.

We shall print, for the present, a surplus number, expecting that they will be called for.

TERMS \$2,00 per annum, payable in advance or at the annual meeting of the Associate Synod

In addition to the ministers and preachers of the Associate church, the following persons are authorized to act as agents:

| | |
|--|---|
| James Moorhead, Mercer, Mercer Co. Pa. | James Galloway, Jr., Xenia, Ohio. |
| John Smart, Huntingdon, Pa. | Wm. Morris, Baltimore, Md. |
| Andrew Monroe, Cannonsburgh, Pa. | M'Neil & Stevenson, Cambridge, Washington |
| John P. Dickey, Pittsburgh, Pa. | Co. N. Y. |
| John M'Cleary, York Centre, Livingston Co. | A. Bachop, Argyle, Washington Co. N. Y. |
| N. Y. | Philip Watts, Shelbyville, Ky. |
| Samuel Preston, Jr. Abingdon, Va. | |

Subscribers in Indiana, Illinois, and Missouri, are requested to make payment to the Synod's Missionaries, who will also receive and forward the names of new subscribers.

Agents or others may enclose money to us at our risk, and at our expense where more than \$5 is enclosed.

☞ The Post-Office to which the work is directed should always be named, when money is forwarded. This is very important; for it is the only guide we have to give credits accurately, as there is a number of names alike on our list, directed to different Post-Offices. ☞

•• All letters relating to the Monitor, whether they contain communications for our pages, or names of subscribers, or remittances of money, should be addressed to B. D. PACKARD & Co. or to CHAUNCEY WEBSTER, 71 State-street, Albany.

OWEN ON THE SPIRIT.—Price \$1.12—an excellent edition, just received and for sale, by
B. D. PACKARD & Co. 71 State-street.

BOSTON'S FOUR FOLD STATE.—Price \$1.00 per copy—New edition, for sale by
B. D. PACKARD & Co. 71 State-street.

BOSTON ON THE COVENANTS—In two volumes—Price 1.50—For sale by
B. D. PACKARD & Co. 71 State-street

THE SHORTER, AND MUCKERSIE'S CATECHISMS.—Price \$2.00 per hundred
copies—Constantly on hand and for sale by
B. D. PACKARD & Co. 71 State-street.

PSALMS OF DAVID, On large type, with an original Preface by the Rev. James Martin, pastor
of the Associate Presbyterian congregation of Albany. Just published and for sale by
B. D. PACKARD & Co. 71 State-street.

POCKET BIBLES with the Psalms—several different kinds. Different prices. For sale by
B. D. PACKARD & Co. 71 State-street.

BIBLES, Quarto, Octavo and Duodecimo—a great variety. For sale by
B. D. PACKARD & Co. 71 State-street.

GOSPEL TRUTH accurately stated and illustrated, by the Rev. Messrs. James Hog, Thomas Bos-
ton, Ebenezer and Ralph Erskine, and others—occasioned by the re-publication of the Marrow of Me-
dian Divinity. Price \$1.00. For sale by
B. D. PACKARD & Co. 71 State-street.

N.B. On all the above works a liberal discount will be made to such as purchase to sell again.